The Christian East

A QUARTERLY REVIEW DEVOTED TO THE STUDY OF THE EASTERN CHURCHES

EDITED BY THE
REV. CANON J. A. DOUGLAS, B.D., Ph.D.,
AND THE REV. R. M. FRENCH, M.A.

MARCH, 1925.

Vol. VI. No. 1. 1s. 6d.

THE ANGLO-EAST & EASTERN CHURCHES ASSOCN.

THE FAITH PRESS, LTD.

81016
PER
C463e
6
R25-26

CONTENTS.

DESIGNATION AND CONSECRATION OF A RUSSIAN BISHOP.—By a Russian Berlin Correspondent ... 1

THE ŒCUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE.—By John A. Douglas, Ph.D. 4

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE 34

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE.—By Professor Hamilcar Alivisatos, of the University of Athens 40

REMEMBER RUSSIA!—By Estelle Blyth 47

Le Sieur Athelstan Riley, de la Trinité, en Jersey.

Founder and since its Foundation President of the Anglican and Eastern Churches Association.

MARCH, 1925.] [VOL. VI. NO. 1.

The Christian East

DESIGNATION AND CONSECRATION OF A RUSSIAN BISHOP.

BY A RUSSIAN BERLIN CORRESPONDENT.

UNTIL last year, when for the first time a Bishop was elected and consecrated for Berlin in the person of the Archimandrite Tikhon—whose civil surname is Lyashenko—the senior priest of the Russian Parish of Berlin, the Russian Church had never in all its long history possessed an Episcopal Throne in Western Europe. Much less had it consummated the Sacrament of an Episcopal Consecration outside its own jurisdictional boundaries.

The Metropolitan Evlogie, Archbishop of Holm and Volniya, it is true, had been appointed in 1921 by the Patriarch Tikhon's mandate to be Metropolitan of all Russian Churches in Western Europe, but no city had been specified as that of his Throne.

In 1923 the Metropolitan Evlogie decided that the elevation of the Archimandrite Tikhon to the Episcopate was desirable and forwarded a petition to the Patriarch Tikhon for authorisation to consecrate him. The Patriarch replied in the affirmative, but his answer was not received by the Metropolitan to whom its sending only became known later through the private letter of a correspondent who had discussed the matter with His Holiness.

In August, 1923, the Russian Episcopal Council which met at Karlowicz, the Palace of the Patriarch of Jugo-Slavia, and is the highest Church authority for Russians outside Russia, decreed the erection of Episcopal Thrones in the principal capital cities within its jurisdiction, and, as the first, the erection of an Episcopal Throne in Berlin.

In consequence, the Episcopal Synod which is in continual session at Karlowicz, authorised the Metropolitan Evlogie to proceed with the consecration of his nominee, the Archimandrite Tikhon, both as Bishop of the newly-created jurisdiction and as Metropolitan Vicar of Western Europe.

In Russia itself an Episcopal Consecration is a solemnity of considerable rarity, and, being always consummated in capital cities, hardly ever takes place in the presence of the flock for whom the consecrand is designate. Nor is the Bishop designated by his future people.

The Consecration of the Archimandrite Tikhon, however, was not only consummated in the midst of his particular flock, but the fact that the latter had twice addressed a designation to the ecclesiastical authorities made his consecration a peculiarly intimate matter to those present and added personal emotion to its natural impressiveness.

By Canon Law Episcopal Consecration cannot be administered by less than two Bishops. The Metropolitan Evlogie had therefore invited Bishop Sergios, the president of the Russian Parish of Prague, to attend in Berlin for the rite.

The Russian Church of Berlin not being large enough to hold the whole Russian colony, admission to the ceremony was by ticket, among those attending being the German Ministers of Cults, of Foreign Affairs and of the Interior, together with the Anglican Chaplain and representatives of the various German Protestant denominations.

The Designation took place at 5 p.m. on the eve of the Consecration in a crowded church before the singing of the All-night Vigil.

After the Metropolitan Evlogie and Bishop Sergios, robed in mandyas and the lesser vestments, had proceeded from the altar, *i.e.*, the sanctuary, to an ambo—a platform—specially constructed in the centre of the nave, and had taken their seats, the Protodiakon conducted the Archimandrite to the place assigned him in front of the ambo. The deputy or Chancellor of the Eparchal Jurisdiction then read the Act of Designating the Archimandrite Tikhon to be Bishop in Berlin, and the latter having knelt to receive the blessing of the two Bishops, delivered the appropriate discourse to his flock. To be a Bishop of the Russian Church in the days of its Golgotha, he told them, was a hard thing. But since they had designated him three times he could not refuse what seemed the vocation of God's Holy Spirit. The circumstances of the time and of their exile moved many of those who heard his simple and touching words to tears.

The short prayers which are only recited by Bishops were then sung and the Ceremony of Designation concluded with repeated cries of " Long years to the Patriarch Tikhon, to the Metropolitan Evlogie, to Bishop Serge and to the Archimandrite Tikhon."

Next morning at 9 a.m. the Metropolitan Evlogie and Bishop Serge, in full vestments, having taken their seat on their Thrones upon the ambo before the Liturgy began, and the Royal Doors having been opened, the Russian Archimandrite John and the Greek, Leontios, solemnly led the newly-designated Bishop, robed in mandyas, from the altar and placed him in front of the ambo upon a tapestry in which was woven, as prescribed, the picture of a huge eagle, flying over his cathedral city. When, in accordance with the rite, the Metropolitan Evlogie had asked him why he had come to

him and he, standing on the eagle's tail, had replied, " To seek consecration by the laying-on of hands," the Metropolitan bade him make profession of the Orthodox Faith and he recited the Creed. That form of question and answer was repeated twice, the Archimandrite standing next on the eagle's body and finally on its head, and making at each answer an increasingly emphasised profession of the Articles of the Faith, each of which, uttered in his sympathetic and penetrating voice, moved the crowded congregation intensely.

The Archimandrite then received the Consecrating Bishop's blessing, and having been led inside the eikonostasis by the two Archimandrites, took his stand upon the episcopal eagle-carpet, and the Liturgy began.

After the Little Entrance, the Archimandrite, who had come into the nave by the Door of the Prothesis, was solemnly conducted with his Consecrators through the Royal Doors, the whole assembly loudly and emphatically testifying its assent to his consecration with threefold cries of " Axios " (" He is worthy "), knelt before the Holy Table and placed his hands upon it. To the soft and humble singing of the ancient Kyrie Eleison, the two Bishops then laid their hands upon his head and he received that Grace of the Episcopate which has been passed down through the ages in the Apostolic succession.

At that moment it seemed to many as if the Apostle, St. Andrew, who appeared to consecrate the infant Russian Church at Kiev, was bodily present in the Church.

After the prayers of the laying-on of hands had been said, the Consecrators proceeded to vest the newly-consecrated Bishop Tikhon, whose cheeks were wet with tears, in his episcopal robes and mitre, and the church rang again and again with the reiterated chanting of " Axios, he is worthy."

At the conclusion of the Liturgy, the Metropolitan Evlogie proceeded to the steps of the Royal Doors, and having spoken to the people a few words of hope and encouragement, transmitted his pastoral staff to the new Bishop with the words: " I deliver this Staff to thee as a sign of thy possession of full episcopal power and authority. Let it not only be to thee a support of thy weakness, but let it also in thy hands, as did its pattern in the hands of Moses the servant of God, strike the living waters of Divine Doctrine from the Rock and scatter the dark forces of the enemies of the Church of God."

Thereupon Bishop Tikhon, having received the Staff in his hands, took his place upon the ambo and commenced to bless the congregation, every member of which crowded to him to express their delight at his consecration and their personal devotion to him, so that he remained for a long time blessing them.

The whole ceremony occupied exactly three hours.

THE ŒCUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE.

By John A. Douglas, Ph.D.

IF it involved no other consequence, the expulsion of the Œcumenical Patriarch himself from their dominions on January 30th by the Angoran authorities would signify the putting a period to the masterly attitude of inactive hostility which they have observed towards the Patriarchate as an institution since the abdication of Meletios IV. in November, 1923.

At the time of writing, the end of February, it is true that nothing more than this has happened. On the ground that he was not resident in Constantinople before October, 1918 (*i.e.*, the date specified at Lausanne), Angora scheduled the Patriarch as liable to "exchange," *i.e.*, to expulsion. The Mixed Commission of Neutrals, Turks and Greeks, charged under the Lausanne Treaty with adjudicating on doubtful cases of "exchangeability," decided that in his individual capacity he was liable to exchange, but declared that, in view of Ismet's pledge at Lausanne in regard to the maintenance of the Patriarchate at Constantinople, his liability to "exchange" as a Metropolitan-Synodal was a question beyond its competence. Accordingly it refused to issue the papers necessary under the Treaty for his legal expulsion, and, except by those who had information as to what had been determined upon at Angora, it was assumed that the business was ended. The matter would be referred, according to the Treaty's provision, to the Hague Tribunal, by which, since in 1918 all Metropolitans of the Patriarchate were domiciled under Ottoman Law at the Phanar, and especially since, let alone the Patriarch, the Metropolitans-Synodal are indispensable to the functioning of the Patriarchate, the Turkish claim would be dismissed in due course. Mustapha Kemal, however, knew what, if the case reached the Hague, would happen, as well as the optimists. He had not been bluffing, but had been proceeding according to plan, his objective being a step towards the final de-hellenisation of Constantinople by making the position of the 200,000 Greeks whose presence in that city he had only conceded after a protracted struggle at Lausanne, impossible through the turkification or expulsion of the Patriarchate. If the Patriarchate could be turkified, and they remained, it could be used to destroy their Hellenic consciousness. If it were expelled, they would be left without a centre. Accordingly, in spite of the representations of Great Britain, the Turkish police roused Constantine VI. from his bed at 6.30 a.m. on January 30th, bade him dress, hurried him into the Conventional train, escorted him to the Thracian frontier, and sent him unceremoniously across it into Greece. Since then, Angora has refused stiffly even to consider a note from the Greek Government proposing that, under

the Treaty of Lausanne, the legality of its action should be referred to the Hague, Shukhri, its Foreign Secretary, informing his Parliament on February 22nd that the affair is purely internal, that there is no ground for complaint, and that he would receive no advice to accept the Greek demand for arbitration from anyone whatever. Meanwhile, the Greek Government has protested and has appealed to the League of Nations, the competence of which to intervene has been explicitly rejected by the Turks.

That, whatever be the upshot of this rough-handling of the Patriarch, things can be the same again with the Patriarchate, is clearly impossible. In the unlikely event of Constantine VI. being allowed by the Turks to return to his cathedral city, he can do so wisely only with defined guarantees. If the suggestion put out in Constantinople communiqués be adopted and a Turkish subject, acceptable to Angora, be elected in his place, it will be easy to make the institution an instrument facile and ready for the use which Mustapha Kemal designs for it.

But before considering the future, it will be well to sketch the history and characteristics which make the fate of the Œcumenical Patriarchate the concern not only of the Greek nation, nor even of the Orthodox world, but of the whole Christian Civilisation.

ORIGIN OF THE ŒCUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE.

Under the heathen Emperors of Rome the great capital cities of the provinces were in the relation of mother cities to the churches within their spheres of influence, but their consequent jurisdictions over them were varied and ill-defined. The establishment of Christianity by Constantine the Great resulted in the working out of the ordered system of ecclesiastical jurisdiction which obtained throughout the *Œcumene—sc.*, the Roman Empire in its widest limits—until the Great Schism of 1054 and which still obtains in the East to-day. The lines on which that system was based were settled by the labours of the first four Œcumenical Councils (Nikæa 325, Constantinople 381, Ephesus 431, Chalcedon 451), and started from the traditional jurisdictions spoken of above.

In 325 there was no central jurisdiction, but Rome was the ecclesiastical mother city of Western Europe, and, as the capital of the Œcumenical Empire of Rome, was vested with a certain pre-eminence throughout the Œcumenical Church. Alexandria was the natural mother city of the lands of Egyptian culture and Antioch of those of Syrian, both of which cultures, being comparable to the Greco-Latin, were fixedly averse to being merged in it.

Accordingly, the First Council laid it down in its sixth canon that the bishops of those three great *metropoleis* should continue in the exercise of their existing prerogatives,[1], which with the power of the

[1] The term used, δίκαια, is technical for the functions of an ecclesiastical institution.

Christian Emperors behind them, soon became full and defined rule and jurisdiction. Further, the same canon added that " the churches of the other *eparchies* should keep their prerogatives "—the reference being doubtless to *metropoleis* such as Carthage, the independent mother city of Africa, to Ephesus that of Asia Minor, to Herakleia that of Thrace, to Constantia that of Cyprus, and so on. Though they appear to have exercised less jurisdictional authority in their *eparchies*, these " other churches " and their *eparchies* appear to have acknowledged neither factual nor theoretical jurisdiction over them on the part of any of the three greater *metropoleis*.

Though—the bishops of the *metropoleis*, as all bishops and clergy, having become officials of the State, the interest of which was to strengthen their authority—their prerogatives in their respective eparchies were not only increased and defined, but were henceforth enforced by the secular arm, the First Council thus left the divisions of jurisdiction on their traditional lines.

In the next 150 years, however, the succeeding three Œcumenical Councils, the authority of which for the purpose was held to be incontrovertible, made radical emendations in the Œcumenical system in order to meet the exigencies of the epoch. Ephesus, Herakleia, and other autonomous *metropoleis* were subordinated to greater jurisdictions, and Jerusalem,[1] which had not been autonomous, received equality with the three great sister *metropoleis*. But neither then, nor subsequently at any time, was the inevitability of the exercise of jurisdiction by Rome in the West, of Alexandria in Egypt, or of Antioch in Syria, questioned.[2]

The arrangements subsisting in 325 had been the result of a natural growth, and not of legislation, which the First Council wisely recognised to be avoided unless necessary. Moreover, they were adequate and logical in their time. That they ceased to be so was primarily the direct consequence of the foundation of Constantinople as New Rome, the twin, and except in precedence, the equal sister capital with old Rome of the Œcumenical Roman Empire.

To appreciate the consequences of that epoch-making event upon ecclesiastical polity, it must be remembered that in the theory which was appropriated from the heathen Empire and was held through the Dark and Middle Ages, the Empire of Rome was unique, was divinely ordained and was destined to absorb the whole earth. In other words, it was Christendom, the dominion of the Christ,[3] and the Emperor was His Vicegerent, a *mixta persona*, consecrated and

[1] The Jerusalem Patriarchate was never strictly a pastoral Patriarchate, but was raised to that dignity to be the guardian of the Holy Places.

[2] At one time Sicily and South Italy—Magna Græcia—were included in the Constantinople Patriarchate, their forced latinisation being one of the immediate causes of the Great Schism.

[3] Lord Bryce's book, *The Holy Roman Empire*, remains the best exposition of this theory.

possessed of divine authority and power, not to intrude in the teaching or sacerdotal functions of the priesthood, but, being vested with the swords spiritual and temporal, to see to it that the Divine Law ran in Church and State, which were not separate entities, but bilateral aspects of the Civitas Dei.

It may be that Constantine had never envisaged the possibility that his new Rome would become the sole seat of the Cæsares Augusti, his sacrosanct successors and, therefore, the factual capital of the sacred Œcumenical Empire. Before his day, though in theory indivisible, the Imperial office had often been held conjointly by a college of Emperors, each resident in different areas of the Empire, and, though issuing proclamations, etc., in the names of the whole college, in fact ruling over his own territories. That division of office and responsibility had become almost customary until he himself was left sole Emperor. That he anticipated its persistence is evident from his associating his three sons with himself as Cæsars, and in his will naming them as conjoint Emperors. That the arrangement of a Western Emperor in Old Rome and of an Eastern Emperor in New Rome would be the permanent order must have been his expectation.

In the event, however, the barbarian invasions which had already commenced before the fourth century, submerged the West when it was lost to the direct rule of the Empire. When, in 476, Odovacer, the Goth, forced the last Emperor in the West to resign, he sent the Imperial insignia to Zeno in Constantinople as a token both that he recognised his own kingship to be subordinate to him and that he was left sole ruler of the Œcumenical Empire.

Constantinople, which, as the sister capital of Christendom, must have held a splendid destiny, was thus left its sole Metropolis. While Old Rome, first in the hands of the barbarians and then recovered, 552, to be for a century and a quarter the jealous satellite of its younger sister and rival, kept its sabbaths of relative desolation and insignificance, its material prosperity knew no limits.

The populous and intensely wealthy lands of the East, such as Egypt and Asia Minor, poured their riches into it. As the administrative and economic centre of the Empire, its influence exceeded that of Old Rome in the reigns of the early Cæsars. But above all that—and while Constantine had laid it out to be so, his successors equipped it with incomparable buildings and ransacked the earth to find artistic treasures and renowned monuments to adorn it—as the city of the residence of the Emperor, the Augustus, the sacrosanct Vicegerent of Christ, it was *ab incepto* a Sacred City. Vikings spoke with awe of it as Mucklegarth. The heathen Russians knew of it as Tsarigrad, the Empress City, and in the end were won to Christianity by the accounts of the almost supernatural glory of its magnificence and of the worship of its great Mother Church. The ephemeral

princedoms and kingships, which sprang up in the West, did not reckon themselves valid until they had received a delegated authority from its far-away Emperor, who could not have sent a single *spatharios* against them. Like Odovacer, our own Egbert sought and obtained recognition from it, and wore the Eikon of its Augustus of the day on his royal robe.

The might, glory and world-wide renown of Christian Byzantium and its Sacred Empire may be read in the writings of that modern school of historians, of whom Charles Diehl is the chief and which, like excavators, have dug through the layers of prejudice and belittlement which were the product of Latin *odium theologicum* and caused Gibbon and his successors to make a caricature of its story.

When, therefore, though its decision was grudged in the West, by its third canon the Second Œcumenical Council—Constantinople, 381—gave its bishop or, (since Ephesus and Herakleia had in practice passed under his jurisdiction, as he was already beginning to be called its Archbishop and Patriarch, the second place of ecclesiastical honour at the Old Rome), it was only adjusting the Œcumenical system to urgent existing facts. And, when the Fourth Œcumenical Council (Chalcedon, 451) defined that decision further in its 28th canon, which, like the sixth of the Second Council was cavilled at west of the Adriatic, no one within the limits of the existing rule of the Œcumenical Empire could or did question seriously the wisdom and rightfulness of its action.

Moreover, the decision of Chalcedon, which has neither been superseded nor supplemented by any Œcumenical enactment, not only made *de jure* the Patriarchate which the Archbishop of Constantinople already exercised *de facto*, and so placed that city in the same category as the existing four great *metropoleis*. It also gave him jurisdiction —a most important function—over "the churches among the barbarians"—*sc.* outside the theoretical bonds of the Œcumenical Empire.

A century and a half later, *circ.* 591, in expression of the fact that the Western Patriarchate, though still in theory within the *Œcumene*, having all but passed from the direct rule of the Emperor, the functions of initiative, communication, etc. within the Œcumenical Empire were exercised by the hierarch of the remaining and factual Œcumenical Metropolis, John the Faster, the Patriarch of Constantinople of the day, adopted the style of Œcumenical Patriarch.

That development, which, though also received grudgingly at first in the West, was accepted in the East as right and proper, and ultimately won Œcumenical acquiescence, like the adjustment of ecclesiastical organisation effected by the Council of Chalcedon in recognising the Patriarchate of Constantinople in 451, was no more than the legalisation of existing facts.

By the end of the sixth century, therefore, the offices and function

of the successors of St. Chrysostom on the episcopal throne of New Rome had received broadly their present definition.

As Bishop of Constantinople, or rather as Archbishop—for the City had local suffragan bishops who stood in a peculiar subordination to him—he had pastoral jurisdiction over its clergy and people, and as Patriarch he had metropolitical jurisdiction over the population of a vast territory. In addition to these two offices, he exercised a certain undefined function as the ecclesiastical centre of unity within the realm of the Sacred Œcumenical Empire, and on that account was charged also with jurisdiction over whatever Christianity existed outside the frontiers of Christendom, *sc.* of the theoretical dominion of Christ's Vicegerent, the Emperor.

The many vicissitudes of the thirteen subsequent centuries have made no essential change in those three characteristics.

THE BREAK UP OF ŒCUMENICAL UNITY.

The policy of the Empire, which from the fourth to the ninth centuries used the Church as an instrument to denationalise and to hellenise its peoples of non-Hellenic cultures, ended in the fifth century by provoking the adherence of the Egyptians and Syrians, at least in name, to the current Christological heresies. The consequence was a schism within the Empire which has become permanent —the Coptic and Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite) Churches of to-day, representing the mass of the people of Egypt and of Syria, which was organised by the end of the century into a rival Œcumenical Church with its Patriarchates Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, and the Orthodox Church of to-day, in those countries, with its three Patriarchates representing the minority, the Melkites (Syr., ***melek***, king) as they were called from their obedience to the Emperor. That this, the first open rupture in the unity of Œcumenical Christianity, became incurable, was due to the rise of Islam in the seventh century.

The founder of that religion, it should be noted, declared that Christianity, though afterwards perverted, had been a true revelation and was a preparation for it, and accordingly appropriated to it the concept by which the Sacred Œcumenical Empire regarded itself as an unique, providential, divinely ordered theocracy, destined to extend its rule over the whole earth.

Community of culture and of speech—Arabic and Syriac are closely akin and both were largely spoken in Egypt—made possible the amazing ease with which the first five Khaliphs of Mohammed imposed Islam upon Egypt and the Syrian lands from Babylon to Palestine. By the end of the seventh century, though they failed in their supreme task of capturing Constantinople, the whole of non-hellenic Christendom in the Near East was within their dominion,

and was lost for ever to the rule of the Œcumenical Cæsar. Those conquests were primarily due to the fact, that as the people of Constantinople were afterwards to prefer deliberately the Sultan's turban to the Pope's tiara and for all their sufferings were never to recant their decision, the Egyptian and the Syrian had welcomed the Green Flag in order to escape hellenisation.

The break up of the Œcumenical Empire in the East was followed by the emergence of a second rival, Christendom in the West.

The practical final abandonment of Old Rome by Constantine Pogonatos at the end of the seventh century facilitated an evolution from the chaos of centuries in Western Europe, which culminated in Charlemagne's Consecration by the Pope and Self-Coronation as Cæesar in St. Peter's on Christmas Day, 800 A.D. In theory, he and his successors claimed to be the Western colleagues of the Emperors in the East. In actuality, however, they never received more than a lip-recognition from Constantinople, where the increasing ascendancy of the Papacy in Western Europe, coupled with the formulation of its claims to universal supremacy, made their Empire to be regarded not only as upstart but as schismatic in origin and character. In the two centuries of bickering which ensued, the sharp antithesis of East and West was always material and sometimes formal, so that the final excommunication of the Œcumenical Patriarchate by the Papacy in 1054 only set the seal to a Schism which has remained secular, its root cause having been not the *Filioque* but the Papal claim to supremacy *de jure divino*.

Viewed from the ecclesiastical angle, that Great Schism meant that thenceforward Christendom was divided into three mutually exclusive Churches, each claiming to be the only true Church, namely, the Churches of the East in Communion with the Œcumenical Patriarch, the Papal Obedience and the Egypto-Syrian Church. On the other hand, viewed from the political angle, its result was that, just as the Melkites, being a minority of a minority in those territories of the three lesser Patriarchates which had become Islamic, the flock of the four Eastern Patriarchates which were within the actual boundaries of the Œcumenical Empire had been left almost entirely Greek, or at least of Hellenic culture, so now, the Communion with the West having been lost, the Orthodox Church, as the Constantinople Communion came increasingly to be called, was in danger of being, not international, as was the Papal Obedience, but almost entirely national.

In other words, it was threatened, in effect, with being confined to the jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and if that jurisdiction had not been extended beyond the frontiers of the Œcumenical Empire, would have included only Greeks or hellenised allogenes.

The Bulgars and Slavs, however, who had settled in the Balkans, as also the Slavs of Russia, had been converted to Christianity in

the ninth and tenth centuries, and under the 28th canon of Chalcedon, "as Churches among the barbarians," had been incorporated in the Patriarchate of Constantinople. The Bulgar and Serb Tsardoms which sprang up and gave place to each other from the twelfth century to 1453, each set up their own Patriarchates, the former at Trnova, the latter at Ipek. But Russia remained content to receive its Metropolitans from Constantinople, and the policy of the Empire having changed from hellenisation to permeation by religious and cultural influences, not only Russia but also the Balkan Tsardoms regarded themselves as within the orbit of Constantinople and were content to acknowledge the Œcumenical function of its Patriarch.

FROM THE GREAT SCHISM TO 1453.

From the Great Schism to the capture of Constantinople by Mohammed II. in 1453, the history of the Œcumenical Empire is the history of an extraordinary struggle to persist, conducted with amazing vigour and tenacity, against two powerful and inexorable enemies and rivals—Islam on the East and Papal Europe on the West.

The mission of destroying and of replacing it, which had been tacitly abandoned by the Arab Khaliphates after their two abortive attempts to capture New Rome in the seventh and eighth centuries, was resumed by the Turks, who began to appear as the sword of Islam in the eleventh century and established themselves in Asia Minor, *sc.* in the really Hellenic lands and within the confines of the Œcumenical Patriarchate itself. The first Turkish conquests were of the so-called Seljuks, who, after the preliminary devastations and massacres which are necessitated by the Turkish character, settled down at Nikæa and elsewhere and surrendered to those more humane Arab influences of Islam, which were themselves derived from the Syro-Egyptian cultures. The Seljuk Sultanates were extinguished by the Crusades, but the sack of Constantinople by Innocent IV.'s Crusaders in 1204 and their occupation of the Metropolis of Eastern Christianity, with the substitution of a puppet Papal Emperor and a puppet Papal Patriarch for the legitimate Emperor and Patriarch who fled to Nikæa, the City of the Creed, and waited there until the usurpation had passed, broke the Œcumenical Empire's strength in its own homelands.

The history of the last three centuries of the Œcumenical Empire's existence is the history of little more than of its continually growing weakness and shrinking until its limits became little more than the famous walls with which, far back in 406, Theodosios II. had girded Constantinople. While its Latin enemies filched its territories and harassed it to the maximum of their ability from the West, the Ottoman Turks, so-called after their thirteenth-century eponymous hero and Sultan Othman, took up the old task of Islam

on the East. Through the lack of Turkish mental capability to give it, the *coup de grâce* was indeed delayed until the 29th May, 1453, when the Ottoman Sultan, Mohammed II., stormed Constantinople and the Œcumenical Empire was at last, after eleven hundred and twenty-seven years, extinguished in the blood of the last of the Palæologi, Constantine XIII., who fell in the breach of the hitherto virgin walls of the Œcumenical Metropolis.

That happening, which even though it may be said to have contributed to the Renaissance of Western Europe, has proved a memorable catastrophe to Christian civilisation, closes the first volume of the History of the Œcumenical Patriarchate.

By the end of the sixth century the Throne of Byzantium, which before Constantine had been that of a simple suffragan bishop, had been transformed by the evolution of historical processes into the equal sister of the Throne of the Old-World Capital, and had become the Throne of the recognised Metropolos of that varied Eastern Christendom which was practically identical with the Sacred Œcumenical Empire. Schism, first with the non-Hellenic Eastern Christianities and then with Old Rome and the West, having divided Christendom into three Churches, each with the pretension to be exclusive of the other two, it was left alone as the centre of unity and primatial see of a Church, which, though it could still claim, in the technical sense, to be Œcumenical, was isolated and, except for its recent barbarian converts, was both Greek altogether, and, as to nineteen-twentieths of its people, within the Constantinopolitan Patriarchal jurisdiction.

Much exaggeration and some nonsense has been written about a "Cæsaropapism," which is said to have characterised the Œcumenical Empire, and to have made the Œcumenical Patriarch a puppet of the Emperor.

The concept of a single theocratic world state—an Empire which *was* Christendom—of which Church and State were not contrasted divisions but bilateral expressions of the one entity and in which the Emperor existed as a *mixta persona*, a Vicegerent charged with seeing that all law conformed to the Divine Revelation and that the Divine Law obtained in every activity and relation, has happily vanished from the earth. But in their 1100 years the Emperors rarely overstepped the proper limits of that theory and such intrusions as they made into the region of the spiritual were for the most part successfully resisted by the clergy of their dominions, led by the Œcumenical Patriarch. A summary of the history of the Œcumenical Patriarchate under the Empire thus shows that, allowing for the Patriarch being the second person in the vast and complex administrative machinery which the Imperial tradition had created, his offices and functions were essentially the same in 1054 or 1453 as after the latter date or as they are to-day.

THE EFFECTS OF TURKISH RULE UPON THE ŒCUMENICAL PATRIARCHATE.

The Turkish Conquest subjugated the Œcumenical Patriarchs and their historic flocks to a grinding helotage, but, while in no way invalidating my last remark, had three effects which, without touching its theory, produced great alterations in the life of the Orthodox Church and possessed great implications for the Œcumenical Patriarchate itself.

I. While the Arab conquest of Egypt and the Syrian lands had reduced communication between their Orthodox population and Constantinople to a minimum, and in the three centuries previous to 1453, the setting up of the Bulgar and Serb Patriarchates, which claimed to be autonomous, had cut the non-Greek Balkans off from the Patriarchate, the greater part of its own jurisdiction in Asia Minor had been for two centuries in the hands of the Turks.

The fall of Constantinople restored the Patriarch to his proper flock, and the Balkan Tsardom, being overwhelmed before the final cataclysm, the Bulgars, Slavs and Roumanians came again under his Patriarchal jurisdiction. Further, Sultan Selim I., who, taking over the succession from Mutawakkil, the last of the Eastern Arab Khaliphs, transmuted the Turkish Sultanate into a putatively universal Turkish Khaliphate, having added Egypt and the Syrian lands to his dominions in 1516, the three other Eastern Patriarchates were thus again in the same Empire with Constantinople. The exercise of the Œcumenical function of the Constantinopolitan Patriarch, which had been made easier by that fact, was further facilitated by the *millet* arrangements which will be described below.

II. On the other hand, while solidarity among the Orthodox within the Khaliph-Sultanate was restored, communication with the rest of the Christian world became thenceforward always difficult and sometimes perilous. The Constantinopolitan Patriarchate was thus cut off in a large degree from Russia, a portion of its immediate jurisdiction. This isolation from a portion of its actual territory was intensified by the fact that the Russian Grand Prince, Ivan the Terrible, having married the niece of Constantine XIII., declared himself the heir of the Byzantine Empire, and, adopting the title of Tsar, initiated that tradition which made the recovery of Constantinople and the reconsecration of St. Sophia the hope and calling of the Russian Tsardom. If fear of the Russian Tsars sometimes mitigated the oppression of their Christian helots by the Turks, it also made the latter perpetually suspicious of every communication between the Œcumenical Patriarch and his Russian flock. In consequence of this, no less than of the growing magnificence and power of the Tsars, the Œcumenical Patriarch Jeremiah II., acting in concert with his three brother-Patriarchs, proclaimed, in

1589, the already practically autonomous Church of Russia to have become an autokephalous and sister Patriarchate and its Metropolitan to have taken the place of the Patriarch of Old Rome in the College of five Patriarchs specified at Chalcedon in 451.

Apart from the special rich and vitalising contributions which Russian Church life, Russian thought and Russian mysticism left free to evolve for themselves, have made to Orthodoxy, and apart from its repercussions in general European history, the erection of the Russian Patriarchate, with its ultimate power and numerical majority in the whole Communion, delivered the Orthodox Church from the danger of becoming simply ethnical.

The precedent so set was followed in the seventeenth century by the constitution of the Serbs, who trekked into the Austrian dominions with the successor of the old Patriarchs of Ipek, and of the Roumanians in Transylvania, into the autokephalous Patriarchates of Karlowicz, Hermannstadt and Czernowicz, and in the nineteenth, on the carving of sovereign national states out of Turkey in the Balkans, by that of the erection of autokephalous Metropolitical Churches for Serbia, Greece, Roumania and Bulgaria, their co-nationals in Turkey, of course, remaining under the Œcumenical Patriarchate. Since the Great War two of these latter, having absorbed their co-nationals in Austria-Hungary, have declared themselves Patriarchal, an elevation which connotes simply an increase of extrinsic dignity and of intrinsic authority.

There is no canon law to the effect, but it is now held as a broad rule of economy that in any sovereign state which possesses an Orthodox majority, the Patriarch or Synod of the mother Church assenting, the local national Church should receive autokephaly. Where there is no Orthodox majority, the national Church becomes autonomous, *i.e.*, remains subordinate to its recent centre of jurisdiction, or becomes so to the Œcumenical Patriarchate—there is a controversy as to which—but otherwise exercises the fullest internal freedom.

These recent developments have given the Orthodox Church as nearly a supra-national character as is probably realisable.

III. In the ancient world, and especially in the Near East, communities of different and highly contrasted religions were not only included in the same state, but were interspersed in the same localities. In consequence, since these several religions were racial in character as well as in origin and their distinctions were manifest not only in outlook and *statuts personnels* but in language and even in dress, and since, just as the relations of a pig-eating Hindoo with a cow-eating Moslem are usually confined to-day to necessary business and so on, and the two do not live side by side easily, the peoples of different religions in an ancient State formed each what in reality

was a little world of its own. That meant that, while they must not transgress the laws or prejudices of the nation among which they dwelt, non-indigenous minorities were allowed inevitably not only freedom to practise their rites, but also to have their own systems of education, their own religious judicature to administer their laws of marriage and inheritance, and so forth. Religion, therefore, in its wider and old-world sense included the whole of a man's personal as opposed to his civic life, and every city and countryside contained religious communities, each with legally established internal autonomous economy. Obviously, that system was a natural and spontaneous *modus vivendi*, and not a concession to Statecraft. Nebuchadrezzar could transplant the Jews, but to convert them into Babylonians did not enter his head, and its refusal to legalise the early Christian communities, whatever the motive, was the ground alleged by heathen Rome for legalising their persecution. From time immemorial, therefore, the criterion of nationality as contrasted with citizenship in the East has been Religion.

The recognition of those elementary and imperious facts explains the ease with which Egypt and the Syrian lands passed to Islam, and why the relatively small armies of Mohammed's first five Khaliphs were received by the non-Orthodox majorities everywhere as deliverers from hellenisation. There is no instance in history of the sudden forced, wholesale conversion of a civilised nation from its own religion to that of a conqueror. Just because a nation cannot change its ideology and customs at any bidding, an attempt of that type produces invariable resistance, if only the resistance of sheep.

In Egypt and the Syrian lands it would have been met with a desperation which, without help from the Byzantine Army, would have broken the impact of Islam. Moreover, the native Christians removed, those countries would have been desolate wildernesses, and Islam needed their culture and their industry. Permeation and infusion were the only policy possible.

On the other hand, if, as has been said, Islam had taken over the character of an Œcumenical Empire, it had taken it over with a vengeance. It was the Dar-es-Salaam, the House of Peace, preordained to fight against the Dar-el-Harb, the House of War, *sc.* the rest of the world, until it had subdued and absorbed it. Those who by predestination did not enter it, must be wiped out.

The setting the conquered Christian the choice of death or conversion was evaded, and their good-will won by the provisions that when Christians—and Jews—submitted to the Green Flag, they should not only be spared their lives but safeguarded in their religion, *i.e.*, in their nationality, and that an agreement with a Christian must be held binding on a Moslem until the former broke it.

The monks of Sinai still possess a letter sent them by Mohammed, bearing his own sign-manual and said to have been dictated by him

to the Khaliph Ali, his son-in-law, which guarantees toleration to the Christian *Din*, *i.e.*, Religion in that wider sense, which includes education, *statuts personnels*, judicial arrangements, and so on.

Possibly that document—which Selim I. knelt to kiss as the most precious relic in Islam—is spurious, but, with the germane texts in the Kur'an, and the charters issued by Mohammed's first five Khaliphs to the Christian communities of Persia as well as of Egypt and Syria, it forms a fundamental of the Shari'at, *sc.* the Sacred Law of Islam, which is itself an explication of the Kur'an by the Ulema or doctors of Islam, and with which the laws of every true Moslem State must conform.

Accordingly, it was not from statecraft, but under the inexorable Shari'at that, from the earliest Moslem times, the Christians of every country, brought under the Green Flag, have invariably been offered and have received " capitulations " which permitted them to remain Christians, to retain their churches, and to organise themselves into legal communities for the conduct of their educational system and the administration of their *statuts personnels*. Such communities, the respective spiritual heads of which must, by Mohammed's prescription, preside over and represent them to their Moslem masters, were known as *millets*, *i.e.*, languages, and their members as *rayah*, *i.e.*, cattle of the herd.

Such Christian *millets* were, of course, nowhere in equality with Islam. In a Moslem land a Christian had no rights, for rights could be possessed only by a Moslem. If the Christian received the toleration prescribed by the Shari'at, he must reckon it a concession of mercy and condescension. If he were heavily taxed, if he disliked the regulations for dress or demeanour laid down for him by his masters, if occasionally he were subject to harsh treatment, he must remember that he only lived at the good pleasure of Islam, and that he was a being essentially inferior to the Moslem.

Still, if the toleration of the Shari'at, as applied to the Egyptian and Syrian Christian, permitted their grinding oppression and degradation, no Arab Khaliph, other than mad Hakim, the Druse, ever spoke of abrogating it altogether, and even he was compelled by his *Ulema* to abandon his plans for destroying the Christian *millets*. It was probably far more through apostasy for the sake of obtaining the advantages of being Moslem than through any actual persecution or fear of persecution that the numbers of the Christians of Egypt and the Syrian lands sank from many millions to a few hundred thousand.

The Ottoman Sultans who conquered Asia Minor piecemeal in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, had greater need of Christian *rayah* than had the Arabs of the seventh century in their conquests, for their numbers were exiguous, and they themselves, in their ignorance of commerce, agriculture and the arts of settled life, were as much lower in the cultural scale than the Arabs as were the Greeks

of Asia Minor of the thirteenth century superior to the Egyptians and Syrians of the seventh century.

They were also shrewdly conscious of the danger of driving the Greeks with their great tradition of arms and the Armenians with their extraordinary native courage to despair. Above all they knew that the one thing they had to fear was that the Greeks might be driuen by harsh treatment to make that surrender to the Popacy—the abortive 'Union' Ferrara–Florence, 1438–9, was familiar—which would bring Western Europe to their rescue. Accordingly, at every stage of the growth of the little Ottoman Sultanate, founded in Bithynia by Ertogrul, to its final conquest of Constantinople, it granted the Christians the capitulations enjoined by the Shari'at until in 1453 its Christian *millet* coincided with the Œcumenical Patriarchate and that hierarch was the *millet bashleri*, *i.e.*, its head.

Subjugation to the Turk, therefore, brought it about not only that the Œcumenical Patriarchate recovered effective oversight of his own proper Patriarchate but that he was placed at the head of the Christian *millet*—the *Roum millet* as it was called in Ottoman parlance—first in that Patriarchate and subsequently in the three other Eastern Patriarchates.

The functions with which the Œcumenical Patriarchs became invested as heads of the *millet* were described during the Conference at Lausanne by the Turks and lesser organs of our Press, such as the *Daily Mail*, and other apologists as "political." They were so in no reasonable sense. That Lord Curzon and his British colleagues at the Conference not only allowed the misleading use of the term to pass unchallenged but actually employed it themselves, must astound those who have considered the matter.

In England to-day, as in France and other Western countries, we who scarcely trouble to know the religion of our neighbours and are latitudinarian in regard to inconsistencies, have plentiful experience of the hardships inflicted by a single state law for questions relating to *statuts personnels*, such as divorce, and by a single state system of education. In a Moslem State with a considerable Christian minority, or *vice versa*, such a legal equation is impossible. In India we have always conceded Moslems their special schools, law courts, etc., under their own management. France, which had set out to make French citizens of the Algerines in 1892, by bringing them under ordinary French law courts, had to abandon that cherished project and to restore the independence of the Moslem community in such matters. And so on. A polygamist Moslem cannot administer the marriage law of Christian monogamists. Moslem inheritance rests on the Arab tradition as adapted in the Kur'an, Christian on Roman as adapted from the Bible. Moslem education is governed entirely by the Shari'at, and to educate Moslems and Christians in

the State schools of Turkey is to educate the latter in a Moslem atmosphere.

The " political " functions with which the Patriarchate was invested in 1453 were simply those religio-social functions which no Moslem could be conceived as exercising towards the huge Christian population which had surrendered to the rule of the Sultans. They were these :

(1) Supervision of the judicial administration of the *millet's* marriage and testamentary laws ;

(2) Supervision of its educational system ;

(3) Supervision of its charitable and ecclesiastical endowments ;

(4) Its representation to the Sultan.

The first four of these functions were not arbitrary, but constitutional, and *mutatis mutandis*, had been exercised by the Œcumenical Partiarchs under the Emperors. Before 1453 bishops in their dioceses had exercised them in the first instance and the Patriarchs in their Patriarchates had supervised their actions. The simple change was that, whereas the Œcumenical Patriarch had acted as the Emperor's assessor in the final appeal, he was now with his Synod the sole Supreme Court, and that he made his representations not to the Christian Emperor but to the Moslem Sultan. Indeed, Mohammed, the Conqueror, showed practical wisdom in allowing the great officials of the Empire, such as the Grand Logothete or Recorder, who had dealt with matters involving *statuts personnels*, to be perpetuated in the Œcumenical Patriarch's Court.

Under the Turks, therefore, the Œcumenical Patriarchs were not only able to exercise their ecclesiastical functions in a measure greater than that possible to their immediate predecessors, but through their functions as *millet bashleri* became in a real sense the symbollic head of their nation.

FROM 1453 TO THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Though holding an office of great practical importance and authority the Œcumenical Patriarch continued to exist under the Turks only because he was indispensable to his masters.

The admiration expressed by writers such as Voltaire at the tolerance with which the Sultans permitted the Patriarch and the *rayah* to live their lives and to enjoy the exercise of their religion in Moslem Turkey was altogether as misplaced as the regrets of Tala'at and the Young Turks that the old Heroes of Islam had not exterminated them were based on an impossibility. Even in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries the attempted elimination of the Christian *millet* would have evoked a desperation which, without the help of Russia, would have eliminated the Turk himself. But apart from all that, open contempt for the Shari'at would have produced a revolution in Islam itself.

Consequently, the most fanatic Sultans never failed to do lip-

service to the prescription of the Founder of the Kaliphate. With that limitation, however, they treated their *rayah* as roughly as they dared from the first, and again and again violated the letter of its provisions. Thus, as his Ottoman predecessors had done in every city which they captured, Mohammed II. seized the finest churches in Constantinople, and with them St. Sophia, in 1453, and turned them into mosques. In 1514 Selim I. did the same by all the Christian churches in the city except one. Twice, at least, in 1515 and in 1624, the Sultan of the day, and his Divan, prepared to massacre the Christian *millet* out of hand, and was prevented only by the plain warning of the *Ulema* that Islam would not tolerate so open a violation of the Shari'at. In general the larger letters of the capitulations were observed, but within their limits the oppression of the *rayah* by the Turks was grinding, persistent and altogether degrading —*e.g.*, a *kharatch* or poll tax had to be paid annually by every Christian for leave to continue to " wear his head " ; churches must not have bells ; a Christian must not sit without permission in a Turk's presence ; special forms of dress ; the riding of a horse or carrying a gun were forbidden to the *rayah* ; once every five years the blood tax of one boy out of every five under seven was collected from the Christians, and the children so selected were brought up as Moslems ; whatever the outrage, a *rayah* could not be accepted as a witness against a Moslem ; a Christian, an apostate to Islam, could only return to the faith of his fathers at the price of death, and a *rayah* who repeated the *takbir*, " There is but one God and Mahommed is His Apostle "—as witness the solemn decision of the Sheik-ul Islam as late as 1908 in the case of a girl age 12—was such an apostate ; and so on.

Thus the Christian *millet* constituted a sort of underworld, interspersed with the Moslem, but in quite another plane. This Turkish bondage, though it varied in different times and places, produced through its grinding misery a shrinkage of the *millet* comparable to that which, as has been noted above, had been going on in Egypt and Syria from the seventh century. The estimate which I have given elsewhere, is that by the beginning of the nineteenth century the *rayah* had been reduced to from a fourth to two-fifths of their numbers in 1353. As to how far that result ensued from apostasy or from the taking of its womenkind into harems it is impossible to gauge, but the fact that the Turks are not prolific, but none the less increased their numbers throughout the period, points to considerable conversions, while throughout the country there are still communities of Stavriotes, of cryptic Christians who, from fear or for its advantages, outwardly accepted Islam.

The marvel, indeed, is that the crass stupid brutality of the Turk, when he is cruel, being to that of the Arab as a scorpion to a whip, the *millet* persisted at all. The explanation is to be found in the tenacity with which its Greek element clung to its intellectuality,

a characteristic which accounts also for the swiftness with which, once the National State had been constituted in the peninsula, its people took their place among the most progressive nations of the Modern World. Any intelligent visitor to Turkey before the War must have noted the effects of the excellent educational system with which—as distinct from American and other Western colleges and schools—the Patriarchate had equipped its *millet*, but of which the Sultans had allowed the growth grudgingly, the usual danger of suspicion and jealousy on the part of a dominant race towards progress on the part of a subject race making its erection appear dangerous.

Those were not conditions under which wise and strong Patriarchs would attempt great things. Their business was to hold the *millet* to its faith and to the consciousness of its nationality and so to preserve their people from extinction. Several were deposed at the Sultan's whim, and others were maltreated or murdered in his panic. Some, no doubt, were weak and venal, but very many were men of ability, courage and sagacity, and we may reasonably be inclined to reckon the finest chapter in the long history of the Patriarchate to be those centuries of severe repression, in which they showed infinite patience and often no small heroism. Under the Turks the Patriarch's strength has always been to sit still.

IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

The Balkan Wars of Liberation which, with the French Revolution and British Constitutional Progress, were the fruit of the European Liberal Movements of the eighteenth century, brought about a transformation in the organisation of the Orthodox Church without touching the theory which it had derived from the 28th canon of Chalcedon and has conserved immutably. As has been noted above, on the constitution of the several National Balkan States, the Œcumenical Patriarchate passed over its jurisdiction within their areas to autokephalous National Churches, each of which, being freed from Turkish repression, is producing in its theological schools, its slowly reviving monasteries, its local church life, art and literature, its own special contribution to modern Orthodoxy. In consequence the Orthodox sodality of many nationalities—Greek, Russian, Jugo-Slav, Latin-Rouman, Bulgar, Albanian, etc.—is capable of making an unique and varied, if unified, contribution to a future common Christianity of the world.

If that transformation involved a narrowing of the territorial jurisdiction of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, it also heightened its significance as the Centre of Orthodox Unity ; but in no way did it relieve its urgent duty of static quiescence. Even with their economic dependence upon the Christian *millet* and with the satisfaction rendered by their possession to their pride and luxury, the sanctions of the Shari'at had been only just adequate in the past

to restrain the outbursts of the fear of suspicion felt by the Turks towards their *rayah*, who at the close of the eighteenth century still formed the majority of their Empire.

The successful risings of their helots in the first quarter of the nineteenth century in the Balkans roused them to a frenzy of passion and panic which, the Slavs and Roumanians being confined to countries where there were few Moslems, but the Greeks being interspersed as a majority or an appreciable minority throughout Thrace and Asia Minor, which were at the heart of their Empire, knew no limits against the latter.

The word was passed round, accordingly, that the *rayah* had forfeited their capitulations by rebellion, and the Greek victories of 1824–5 were followed by the letting loose of an armed rabble in every great city to massacre its Greek community, with the help of the soldiery. The people of Christian Chios, for example, were extirpated or sold into slavery—lads and girls from the island were sold in Smyrna for a piaster, less than 4d. !—to the number of 10,000, and upwards of 40,000 Greeks were butchered in Constantinople and Smyrna before the indignation of the European ambassadors, especially the threat of armed intervention by the Russians, compelled Mahmoud II. to order a halt.

The next fifty years were years of respite to the Christian *millet* —thanks to the minatory attitude of Russia and to the facts that, while the Sultans dared not alienate the British and French sympathy which at that period alone stopped the Tsars from revenging 1453, the Greeks themselves preferred what, it appeared, would only be a temporary prolongation of the Sultan's rule in Macedonia, Thrace and the Smyrna vilayet to the absorption of Asia Minor and the Balkans into the Russian Tsardom.

The shifting of the European Balance of Power which ensued upon the setting up of the German Empire under the hegemony of Prussia, ended that position. Gladstone's passionate denunciations, first of the Bulgarian atrocities, and then of the Armenian, deprived the Sultans of British protection, and the *rôle* of Turkish protector, thus abandoned, was assumed for Germany by Bismarck secretly and by William II. openly, it being made clear that armed intervention to punish massacres of Christians would entail an European War.

The Sultan of the period, Abd-ul-Hamid, who displayed preternatural acumen in gauging just how many *rayah* he could massacre with safety, was no more than the exponent of that policy of extirpating Christianity from the Turkish Empire which had been suspended in 1825, but which the loss of more than half the Balkans had stereotyped in the mind of the governing classes among the Turks.

If anything mitigated the hatred of the Young Turks for the Red Sultan, whom they finally deposed in 1910, it was that they outheroded him in that policy. The Balkan Wars of 1912 which cost

Turkey Salonika, Macedonia, West Thrace and the Ægean Islands, stiffened their minds, so that to Tala'at and his colleagues the freedom of dealing with the *rayah* behind the fog of the Great War was not the least of the inducements which led them to enter it.

There is no need to give details here of the sending heralds in 1915-6 through the Armenian countryside to announce that those of that doomed race who did not embrace Islam would be deported, of the march of the death-columns, of the ineffably horrible fate of women and children, or of the doing to death in one way or another of more than a million Armenian *rayah*—men, women and children.

The thing which needs stressing is that, though the Young Turks were mostly materialist atheists of the lowest Paris *boulevardier* pattern, and though they openly avowed their intention of rectifying the costly mistake of " the old Turkish heroes " in allowing Christians to survive and be forefathers to the rebels who had dismembered their Empire, they claimed that it was their duty to extirpate the *rayah* in the name of Islam, inasmuch as, while tolerated under the Shari'at, they had been false to the capitulations, and had attacked the Kaliph in the rear when he was engaged in a *Jehad*—it will be remembered that one had been proclaimed—or Holy War against the Allies. *Post hoc, propter hoc.*

It is the case that some thousands of Armenians did join the Grand Duke Nicholas in his first victorious invasion of Turkey, and though the decision to uproot the Armenian race from its homeland had been taken a month before, that fact served to silence the protests of the more devout Moslem Turks as well as to strengthen the propaganda of the Khaliphate agitation in India.

King Constantine being the Kaiser's brother-in-law, and being determined to keep Greece, which might have changed the course of the War in its earlier stages, and certainly played a no small part in bringing about the Turkish *débâcle* in 1918, and German policy having a great use for Greece, the Greek *rayah* were safeguarded by William II.'s influence until King Constantine had been expelled from Athens and, Mr. Venizelos being in power, Greece entered the War in 1917 on the side of the Allies.

Turkey was then suffering from the preliminary defeats and war-weariness which preluded Allenby's great drive and in the end made her sue for a separate peace, and the Kaiser still desired to make things easier for his brother-in-law's restoration, but those factors were insufficient to restrain Tala'at and his Cabinet from ordering extensive Greek deportations on the Armenian pattern. The work was in progress, nearly half a million Greek *rayah* having been marched from their homes and more than a hundred thousand having perished by hardship and the sword, when the Armistice caused the flight of the Young Turks and Constantinople was occupied by the Allies.

In October, 1918, the air was full everywhere both of President

Wilson's Fourteen Points and of the Doctrine of Self-determination. Greece had taken the Allies' part at the most critical moment. The Armenians had fought for them. Both nations had suffered intense agonies. More than a million folk of their blood had been done to death in consequence of their decisions. French and British statesmen had declared that Turkey must pay the penalty of her treachery in 1914 and of her brutal treatment not only of her *rayah* but of their soldiers taken prisoner in Mesopotamia and Palestine or at the Dardanelles. It seemed altogether certain that when the final settlement was made, the cities and territories in which the Greeks predominated in numbers as in economic importance, such as the Constantinople, Smyrna and Trebizond vilayets and as Eastern Thrace, would either be allowed to incorporate themselves in the Kingdom of Greece or would receive autonomy under the ægis of the League of Nations, and that the Armenian refugees would be restored to their own homelands.

Those anticipations, however, were destined to be rudely disappointed. The Christians of Constantinople received the Allied Fleets as deliverers, flagged their houses, and lined the streets to cheer their Union Jack and Tricouleur—the deceptive tokens of a Liberation which had been dreamed since 1453 but had not in fact arrived. At the insistent request of M. Clémenceau and Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Venizelos sent Greek forces to occupy Smyrna and its hinterland. Europe, and with it the Turks, expected news every day of the reconsecration of St. Sophia as a symbol that the Turkish Tyranny had passed for ever.[1]

The Sultan and the Old Turks at Constantinople were amenable enough to the wishes of Sir H. Rumbold and his colleagues, and a single British Sergeant with a straw in his hand could have ruled Asia Minor.

But nothing happened, and, as the months dragged on, it became plain that the Allies were at variance among themselves over the Near East.

U.S.A. was sick to death of President Wilson, and American concession-hunters were getting ready for an economic exploitation push which, according to Mr. Bierstadt,[2] was in essence more Imperialistic than the Imperialism which the Trusts were stirring the American Puritan States to discover and combat in the Allies.

Having seized the purely Greek Dodecannese in 1912 and being jealous of potential Greek maritime power in the Levant, Italian chauvinism was determined to prevent the union of Greek Epirus with the Hellenic State and to get the Greeks out of Smyrna.

[1] It is stated that to the great wrath of his Foreign Office M. Clémenceau yielded in April, 1919, to Mr. Lloyd George, and assented, but used an ecclesiastical démarche that the Church belonged by right to another Confession than the Orthodox, to withdraw.

[2] *The Great Betrayal.* Hutchinson, 1925.

French tradition had always visioned a paramount *rôle* in the Near East for France and on account of its fruits in cultural and political influence, the historic French Protectorate of Papal interests in the Turkish Empire was valued by the Masonic half of France no less than by the Roman Catholic. Moreover, the Quai d'Orsay, always in rivalry with Downing Street in the Near East and with a new ambition to make France the first Moslem Power in the world, was thoroughly suspicious of the predominant part played by the British Armies in the Syrian campaigns and of the leadership assumed at Constantinople by the British Navy. Always more friendly to Turkey than to Greece, French diplomacy now regarded the latter as the cat's paw of Great Britain, and set itself to oppose its expansion.

In England, the fictitious Indian Khaliphate agitation which was strong only because it aided the Swaraj movement, reinforced the lingering clubman's superstition that, the Turk being a gentleman, his *rayah* are not worth considering, and the strong anti-Orthodox ecclesiastical influences which were making themselves felt in Government circles. War-weariness was everywhere, the Unionist Party was naturally desirous of bringing the Coalition to an end, and Mr. Lloyd George, who was committed to the policy of " cutting out the Turkish cancer," had lost his mandate from the country. Finally, MM. Clémenceau and Poincaré, embittered by the veto given at Versailles to Marshal Foch's plans in regard to the Rhine, were looking forward to getting more sympathy from his successor, and the francophil Northcliffe Press was working for his overthrow.

The Near Eastern question thus became involved both in Paris and in London with Mr. Lloyd George's personality. When procrastination could be protracted no longer, and the Sèvres Treaty was published in August, 1920, it was plain to all who followed events that, though he had been strong enough to win a victory in its production, its ratification would be very difficult.

In effect, its provisions gave Greece the Greek lands of Turkey in Europe up to Chataldja (*i.e.*, all except Constantinople) and the Smyrna vilayet. U.S.A., France, and Italy were to receive as mandated territories those three parts of Asia Minor in which the *rayah* were numerous.

France and Italy took possession of their share, but President Wilson's critics prevented America doing so.

The long delay had had its effect, and Mustapha Kemal, who had already formed the Turkish Nationalist Party at Angora, now repudiated both the Treaty and the Sultan, and, having gathered a following, became a rallying centre to the disbanded Turkish Army. Even in 1920 a relatively small force could have dealt with him, but nothing was done. Italy first and then France withdrew from Asia Minor and left him their munitions. The Bolsheviks entered into alliance with him and supplied him with money and stores. Con-

cessionaries became his champions in Europe, and, in return, though the goods were never delivered, received large promises from him. Guns, stores, and instruction officers were shipped him from France and Italy. And so on.

He thus became the pith ball of the occult anti-Greek and anti-Lloyd George coalition, and by a series of extraordinary events was changed in a couple of years from an adventurer into the Dictator of a restored Turkish State.

His great hour came in September, 1922. Smarting under his failure to bring Mr. Lloyd George to heel in the business of the Rhine, M. Poincaré, who had succeeded M. Millerand as French Premier, put the overthrow of the former as a first end. In England the weariness of the Coalition had become nausea. Finally, the Greek Army was at sixes and sevens in its division of allegiance between Mr. Venizelos and King Constantine, and on its Smyrna front no general could trust his staff and no colonel his rank and file.

Accordingly, every conceivable factor conspiring to help him, Mustapha Kemal broke the Greek lines at Afiun Kara Hissar in September, 1922, and swept down on Smyrna with the deliberate intention of purging it of its predominant Christian and Greek tradition and people.

Details of the Smyrna holocaust are unnecessary here. It will be enough to say that, the city having been sacked systematically for three days, under the eyes of American and Allied ships of war, as of the *Daily Mail* and other correspondents, and 100,000 at least having perished by massacre, the Greek and Armenian quarters having been burnt out, 160,000 men and lads were marched up country to disappear from human ken, and relief ships were permitted to carry the surviving 300,000 women, children and old men away to Greece and other ports of the Levant. Many thousand Smyrniate women and girls are supposed to be still in slavery in the Asiatic hinterland.

Paris, inspired by M. Poincaré, was inclined to believe that, if Smyrna had been burned, its own people must have burnt it, and beflagged itself in Kemal's honour. In London the Rothermere Press, faithful to the Northcliffe tradition, set the pace and, seeing in the bankruptcy of Mr. Lloyd George's Near Eastern policy the instrument to break his Government, the various political groups, opposed to the Coalition, acclaimed the Turkish achievement.

Whatever Mr. George's shortcomings, it will always be quoted to his credit that, with Lord Curzon, he stood firm at the psychological moment. When Ismet Pasha, with Nur-ed-Din, who had presided at Smyrna, in the rear and Kemal in the conning-tower, moved up to Mudania near the Marmora, he preferred the risk of an armed conflict with the Turks in which at best England would have received no help from France and Italy, to handing Constantinople over to them.

The wire fence set up by Sir Charles Harrington in Bithynia saved the situation, and instead of the possible sack of the city, which was still, as Gibbon styled it, the Metropolis of Eastern Christianity, the Allies met the Turks in conference at Lausanne.

Bazarlik is a sacred recreation to the Turks, and when the Conference was opened, as might have been expected, they indulged themselves in an orgy of haggling, their success in which, if they had not been aware of the intention of the Allies to make an agreement with them at almost any cost, would have amazed them. When they went to Lausanne, they had real hope of the retrocession of Greek Western Thrace and of Adrianople, but there was another matter in which they cannot have expected the Allies' complaisance. As soon as the Minorities question was reached, Ismet announced Kemal's decision to expel whatever *rayah* remained in his New Turkey. The barbarity of uprooting the unhappy remnant of an ancient civilisation and adding some hundreds of thousands of miserable peasants and townsfolk to the two millions who were already strewn destitute and dying over the non-Turkish Near East appalled the most hardened statesman at Lausanne, and many weeks elapsed before the Allies acquiesced in it. When they did, Lord Curzon secured a slight concession, which, if the Turks had realised how near they had been to getting the full licence they had asked, they would not have made—Christians who had been in residence in the Constantinople district before October, 1918, were to be suffered to remain. That bargain, however, had no sooner been struck than a fresh and furious bazarlik began, Ismet tabling the inexorable resolve of his Government to expel the Œcumenical Patriarchate, alleging that it had always been a "nest of anti-Turkish intrigues."

Since, as has been said above, Lord Curzon did not challenge the statement, and since in the present crisis British journals—*e.g.*, the *Daily Mail* in a surprising criticism of the Archbishop of Canterbury for interpellating the Government in the House of Lords—have spoken of "political" action on the part of the Patriarchate as if it were proved and incessant, it may be well to take this chance of saying that the thing is a mare's nest which has been constructed from the exercise of the religio-social functions of the Patriarchate. I have gone over Turkish history most carefully for the purpose, but while I find that Patriarchs were beheaded, or otherwise done to death, deposed and maltreated, for offences such as refusing to consent to Christian girls entering harems, for not producing a sufficient tribute, for baptising a Moslem and so forth, I have not found a single instance of a Patriarch conspiring against the Turkish State or even of abetting one of the ceaseless Turkish conspiracies against the Sultans. Cyril Lukaris was bowstrung on the untried charge of being in league with Europe, but historical research has shown conclusively that the charge was a Jesuit inven-

tion. Gregory V. was hung at his own door on Easter Day, 1825, a hundred years ago next month, as a signal for the massacres which revenged the Greek War of Liberation and initiated the extirpation of the *rayah*, now all but accomplished. But the Turks themselves vindicated his martyrdom on the oriental principle which punished the guilty members in the person of the innocent head, and admit that he had done his best to prevent the rising. In fact, the Patriarchs from 1453 to 1918 have been reproached for their over-submissive passivity under Turkish oppression, but until the present need no one had dreamed of suggesting that they had risked political activity, and it was a common pre-War Russian complaint that their influence bolstered up the moribund Turkish Empire and did not aid the Liberating Tsars. It is true that during the period of the Allied occupation the Patriarchate comported itself as if the Turkish flag was to be withdrawn for ever, and issued vigorous denunciations of the massacres which were going on in Asia Minor, but the doing the former was natural and the doing the latter was its manifest duty. In any case, the Lausanne Treaty contains an express amnesty of such actions, and since its signature the Turks admit that they have had nothing of which to complain on this score.

From the description of the *millet* system, given above, it is obvious that the freedom to expel the Œcumenical Patriarchate claimed by Ismet was tautology for the withdrawal of his reluctant concession in the matter of the Greeks of Constantinople. Without schools other than Moslem, with Moslem judges to try their *statuts personnels* causes, and without a centre the *rayah* could not carry on their community life.

From what has been said above as to the constitution of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, it will also be plain that for the Archbishop of Constantinople a willing removal from his Cathedral city is impossible.

That, if ejected by *force majeure*, he should take refuge in some other place, should there, as by *duresse*, carry on his functions and so preserve the life of his Throne, has the precedent of the Patriarchate's Avignon in Nicæa during the Latin intrusion from 1204-61. But the doing so in the twentieth century might clearly bring an end to the Patriarchate, and would certainly have a marked effect upon it.

The civilised world grasped that fact, and Ismet's announcement was followed by a storm of indignation. The Archbishop of Canterbury, wise but courageous as always, took public action. The Archbishop of Upsala, British and American Protestant Confessions, and other religious leaders supported him. In his own words, Lord Curzon received more protests on the matter than on any subject during the whole Conference. In the end he put down his foot sharply. The civilised world, he told Ismet, would be "shocked at the destruction of so famous, historic and ancient an institution." He would

hear no more of the plan. The Patriarchate might be shorn of its "political powers," but must remain at Constantinople in the plenitude of its spiritual functions.

Ismet on the spot saw that, unless he yielded, the Conference was over and that that would mean the end of his bankrupt and disordered nation, and though Kemal at Angora wired him not to give way, like Nelson in the Baltic he shut his eye, and, taking action before he knew of the message, accepted the British ultimatum.

Accordingly, the Lausanne Treaty provided:

(1) That the Christian Minority within the new Turkish State should be "exchanged" for the Moslem Minority in Greece, *i.e.*, that on the one hand the Greek State should be free to expel the unwilling Moslem Minority in its confines, people whom it had no will to expel and who enjoyed great prosperity and equality of citizenship with their Christian co-nationals, and that, on the other, Kemal should be free to seize the property of the unhappy survivors of the Red Harvest and to thrust them out of their fatherland.

(2) That the *rayah* who had been in residence in the Constantinople vilayet before the Allies flew their flags over that city should be entitled to remain in it, and to exercise their religion in the wider sense of the term, and should receive complete amnesty for any acceptance of, or assistance rendered to, its occupation by the Allies.

By an unfortunate and blameworthy omission no mention was made in the Treaty of Ismet's pledge as to the Œcumenical Patriarchate, the giving of which was simply recorded in the Minutes of the Conference.

THE PRESENT CRISIS.

The Patriarch Gerasimos, who had shown himself very submissive to the Porte during the War, and was reckoned Royalist and Germanophil, having abdicated after the Armistice, Dorotheos, Metropolitan of Brusa, whose death at the Ritz Hotel, London, will be remembered, and Nikolaos, Metropolitan of Cæsarea, successively administered the Patriarchate as *locum tenentes* until December, 1921.

In this long vacancy of the Throne nothing of importance happened at the Phanar except that in 1919 the Holy Synod resolved unanimously that in future the Sultan's *berats* permitting a Patriarchal Election and confirming it should neither be asked nor accepted.

In Asia Minor, however, Kemal had set to work steadily to glean where Tala'at had reaped, and to destroy not only the remnant of the *rayah* but also their churches, as, *e.g.*, he had already looted and burnt—October, 1921—the famous seventh-century Church of the Holy Trinity at Nicæa, which even Mohammed II. had left to the *rayah*.

At the same time, the Bolshevik Living Church being undoubtedly the prototype, he had proceeded to set up a Turkish Orthodox Church

for future use. Mention has been made of *rayah* who in whole areas of Asia Minor had gradually lost the use of their native language through disusing it in fear of their masters. A priest, Papa Eftim, being found to act as its head, Kemal enrolled, more or less forcibly, a few thousand of these Turkophone *rayah* in a Church which repudiated the Œcumenical Patriarchate, made Turkish its liturgical language, and declared itself to be altogether happy under Moslem rule, and for later a genuine Bishop, the Metropolitan of Rhodopoulis, was found to be the head. This Church, Kemal destined to supplant the Œcumenical Patriarchate and to be the instrument for turkifying or oppressing whatever *rayah* he might be constrained to retain in his New Turkey.

The project was necessarily pigeon-holed after Ismet's surrender at Lausanne, as will be seen, but was not forgotten.

In December, 1921, a Patriarchal Election being at last held, Meletios IV., who, under Mr. Venizelos' *régime* from 1917 to 1920, had been Metropolitan of Athens, was elected to the Œcumenical Throne.

During his short Patriarchate of less than two years, Meletios IV. showed great vigour in action, and, for example, initiated the Acceptance of Anglican Ordinations in July, 1922, held a Pan-Orthodox Conference to draft far-reaching reforms in Orthodox practice, proposed the Convention of an Eighth Œcumenical Council for 1925 and, under the 28th canon of Chalcedon, 451, claimed to exercise jurisdiction over the Church of Poland and the Churches of Bohemia and the Baltic Succession States. On the other hand, he alienated Conservative Orthodoxy by the drastic nature of the Reform Programme of his Conference, and greatly embittered the Russian exiles, who contended that those Churches remained subject to the Moscow jurisdiction. At the same time his prominence as a Venizelist and miso-Turk made him a *persona ingratissima* at Angora, an attempt to kidnap him being actually made in July, 1923, by Turkish police, who accompanied a riotous mob led by Papa Eftim's agents to the Phanar, and were only foiled by Sir Charles Harrington's ordering the Irish Guards to that quarter of Constantinople.

In consequence, he withdrew to the *skete* of Mylopotamos, Mount Athos, which is itself a *stavropegeion*, or peculiar, of the Patriarchate, and is within the Greek State, shortly before the signature of the Treaty, and finally abdicated in November, 1923.

A full account of the complex procedure of an election to the Œcumenical Throne was given by Archdeacon Malthouras in the CHRISTIAN EAST of July, 1921. The illegal excess of the legal 40 days of widowhood which had occurred between the abdication of Gerasimos and the election of Meletios IV., had been caused by the protest of certain Royalist Metropolitans, who knew that if an election were held a Venizelist would be chosen, that without the representatives from the dioceses of Asia Minor prescribed in the Organic Law of the

Patriarchate, the necessary Electoral College of the first instance could not be constituted.

After Meletios IV.'s election had taken place, some Greek canonists had, indeed, questioned its validity on that ground, but his recognition by the other autokephalous Churches removed their hesitation. The difficulties, however, of holding the election of 1921, had been greatly increased by 1923. Not only were the dioceses of Asia Minor, their people being dead or scattered as jetsam and flotsam outside their own land, unable to send representatives to help constitute the Electoral College, which by the prescription of the Organic Law of the Patriarchate should prepare the list of eligibles to be submitted to the Synod, but no diocese outside the Constantinople vilayet could do so. Further, of the 81 Metropolitans of the Patriarchate, 53 held dioceses in the Greek State and only 14 were actually resident in Constantinople, the other 67 standing no possibility of being permitted by the Turks to attend in person.

The difficulties were surmounted by recourse to a postal ballot, in which all the Metropolitans of the Patriarchate took part and resulted in the election of Gregory VII. by a very large majority, the validity of the election being again established by its recognition in all the autokephalous Churches.

The new Patriarch had been Gerasimos IV.'s Protosynkellos, or chancellor, in the diocese of Chalcedon, and, while not opposing his colleagues, had taken no active part in the anti-Turkish manifestos between 1918 and 1923. His election, however, was received with sullen, if silent hostility at Angora, and, though he was not interfered with, he had received no recognition from the Turks at the time of his death from cancer in December, 1924.

Since the Turks re-occupied Constantinople in October, 1923, they have carried the policy of extirpating the *rayah*, initiated in 1825, to its fulfilment, and Kemal has justified his title of Ghazi, *i.e.*, Conqueror in a Jehad, by expelling whatever Christians remained alive in Turkey, with the exception of the Greeks and Armenians who remain in the old capital under the Lausanne Treaty. The Christian Name has thus been wiped out from its theological homelands, and the Light of the Seven Churches of St. John's Apokalypse has been at last extinguished. The bazaars of Constantinople, and the curio shops of Berlin and Paris, are filled not only with eikons, crosses, Eucharistic vessels and vestments, plundered by the Bolsheviks from the shrines of Russia, but with those looted from the burnt-out churches of Asia Minor.

On the death of Gregory VII. in December, 1924, the same electoral procedure as had been employed in October, 1923, was adopted, the expelled Patriarch Constantine VI. being elected unanimously. His election was followed, however, by the Turkish manœuvre which was described at the beginning of this article. A claim was put in by the

Turks that he and with him all except possibly six of the Metropolitans of the Patriarchate remaining in the new Turkey and all except three who are members of the Synod, are "exchangeable" and, on the Mixed Commission refusing, in view of Ismet's pledge and the Minorities Clauses of the Lausanne Treaty, to issue the necessary papers, the Constantinople Vali, acting on instructions from Angora, expelled him forcibly and with the maximum lack of courtesy. Since then, the threatened Metropolitans have been summoned to appear before the Mixed Commission, and have received a hint that if they wish to remain they had better declare the recent election uncanonical, and elect a Patriarch who is a Turkish subject and unexchangeable, the Turkophone Metropolitan of Rhodopoulos being suggested as a suitable candidate. Europe has been assured that, if it will only become Turkish at heart, the Patriarchate will be cherished, and Greece has protested and suggested arbitration, and on the Turks replying that the matter is purely domestic and outside the scope of the Lausanne Treaty, has appealed to the League of Nations.

That these events have not been fortuitous is established by many considerations.

At Angora to-day there are staunch Moslems, such as Nur-ed-Din, who threw the Metropolitan Chrysostom to the rabble at Smyrna with his own hand. But he and those such as he are relatively few, and are there in spite of the danger attending the election of opponents of the Popular Party. Kemal has been known to push a Hodja aside and to recite himself a Moslem formulary at a public ceremony, but in spite of such occasional lip-service to Moslem susceptibility and of his inscribing the statement that "Islam is the Religion of Turkey," as Article II. of the Turkish Constitution, he is reputed to veer, according to his moods, between a Bolshevik secularism and a Pan-Islamism which is rather an ebullition of egoistic national overvaluation than of religion. However that may be, it is certain that the greater part of his followers are crude atheists, aggressive and unblushing in their avowed intention to recast human life on the basis of utilitarian atheistic materialism. Whatever else in Soviet Russia does not appeal to them, they admire the Bolshevik War on Religion, and would desire to make the new Turkey the area of a like campaign. Among their number are several Caucasian Turkomans who are generally reputed to be agents of Mr. Zinovieff.

While, therefore, Kemal's anti-clericalism in dispossessing the Hodjas from their *medressehs* (religious schools), his contemptuous abolishment of the Khaliphate and his intimation that he proposes to lay hold of the Evkaf, or pious charities of Turkey, which are reckoned to be worth more than a hundred millions, are applauded by them, men who, like Nur-ed-Din, fast in Ramadan and loathe their habits of life, share their will to abolish any and every Christian institution.

This, as many other *imponderabilia*—such as the shifting the capital to Angora—go to confirm the judgment of those who best understand Turkish mentality, that the determination to wipe everything Christian out of Constantinople remains unweakened. The only difference is that some Turks are more ready for precipitate action than others, who would wait for the ripeness of time.

To be just; a consideration of the history of the last four and a half centuries, as summarised above, compels the admission that this is not surprising. From 1453 until recent years the Greek lived in a helotage which was the more bitter because his race had once held the lead in Christian civilisation, in the modern advance of which his master would suffer him to take no part. On the other hand, the Turk had used his *rayah* as his chattel, and so despised him that, if his ideology would have admitted it, he would have been furious at the mere suggestion of mixing with him, after the fashion which in the long issue fused Norman and Saxon into the English nation. Even before the massacre policy was adopted in 1825, the Greek in his heart hated the Turk more fiercely than he hated him at the Conquest and the Turk, knowing, with his Central Asiatic nomad's intuition, that it must be so, and conscious of his inferiority to his *rayah* in number as in intellect, eyed him at all times with frightened suspicion.

A reconciliation between the two races was already next to impossible before the War, but to-day, on the one side, the Turk is not only steeled by the delight of the Greeks at his defeat in 1918, and by the memory of Sèvres, but is uneasily aware that the Greek can never forget the uprooting of his nation from Asia Minor and the million and more of his race done to death. The mad dog stage may pass at Angora, but the will for revenge will not pass in Athens, at least until the Turk is out of Constantinople and Smyrna. The only way to preserve peace between the two is to keep bars between them.

It may well be doubted, therefore, whether the Lausanne decision to restore Constantinople to the Turks' unfettered sovereignty should not have involved the "exchange" of the 200,000 Greek hostages left there, whose situation will always be precarious, the Turk being set on getting rid of their menace one way or the other.

If the present opportunity be not used to advance the work of dechristianising and turkifying Constantinople, it will not be let slip because of Europe the League of Nations produce a change of heart at Angora, but because the Angora *régime* is itself far from stable. Reliable reports point to the prospect of serious trouble in the Kurdish vilayets, where exploitation has heightened the always prevalent dislike of Turkish administration, and where the feudal chieftains—the Kurd is in the Middle Ages—are inclined[1]

[1] Since this article was composed, a serious revolt, led by a Sheikh, has broken out in the Eastern vilayets. Apparently Turks as well as Kurds are sharing in it. Its appeal is said to be the Restoration of the Khaliphate and of the Shari'at.

to champion the disaffected Turkish element, which in turn resents Kemal's handling of the Khaliph and the Moslem Faith.

A forecast of the immediate future is, therefore, impossible, but it would appear not improbable that Angora will offer Greece a "compromise" by which, on condition that they elect a Turkophone Patriarch and so prepare the turkification of the Patriarchate, some of the Metropolitans may be allowed to remain in Constantinople. If a sufficient number of them be not found willing to hand over the keys of the Institution, Angora may proceed to reconstitute it on a Turkish basis through the instrumentality of such Metropolitans as are available, Living Church bishops, if needs be, being imported from Russia as consecrators. Such a scheme is certainly contemplated, and possesses the attraction that under present conditions in Russia, a Turkish *soi-disant* Œcumenical Patriarchate, although repudiated by the Orthodox World, could be used to rehabilitate the Living Church in the eyes of the peasantry, and would be a valuable asset to Turkish diplomacy.

The one thing which appears impossible is that Angora will either admit the return of Constantine VI., a humiliation which would cause a fatal loss of prestige at home and abroad, or give the necessary guarantees which would alone justify the Greek Government securing his abdication and the Metropolitans electing a new Patriarch.

Turkey is profoundly depressed, is bankrupt, and seethes with discontent and potential rebellion, and Kemal may decide to avoid external complications for the time being. Otherwise, if it be not turkified, the Metropolitans will be expelled and with them *de facto* the Patriarchate.

The minimum conditions requisite for the maintenance of the Œcumenical Patriarchate in Constantinople may be stated as:

(1) The guarantee of a free election by all the Bishops of his jurisdiction, whether Turkish subjects or no.

(2) The withdrawal of the demand that the Patriarch must be a Turkish subject, a demand which, in view of the Patriarch's being no longer, as in the time of the Sultans, a great Ottoman Official, and of the great majority of the Metropolitans being Greek subjects, is as preposterous as its concession is uncanonical.

(3) A guarantee of the inviolability of the Patriarch's person and domicile, a thing which, since the recent seizure by the Turkish Police of the Codex of the Acts of the H. Synod and of *dossiers* containing its correspondence with the heads of other Churches, has become essential to the exercise of the Œcumenical function in Constantinople.

(4) The replacement of its present factual supervision of Orthodox *statuts personnels*, education, and charities in Constantinople by a guaranteed legal system under the Patriarchate's guardianship.

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE.

THANKS to the voluntary kindness of Mr. Powys Evans, our frontispiece this quarter is from a pen and ink portrait of the Chairman of the A. and E.C.A. Committee, Mr. Athelstan Riley, the well-known Seigneur de la Trinité in the Isle of Jersey. No need can exist to expound here all that Mr. Riley's interest and work has meant, and means, to our cause. With his schoolfellow at Eton and life-long friend, Mr. W. John Birkbeck, he did yeoman service as a member of the Eastern Church Association, back in the eighties, at which period he made more than one journey to Constantinople and travelled widely in the Near East. When the then Archbishop of Canterbury, Dr. Benson, was considering the starting his Mission of Help to the Assyrians, Mr. Riley undertook to go to the little-known region north-east of Mosul, and it was largely in result of his report that Dr. Benson took action. The story of the planting of the Mission and Mr. Riley's part in it is recorded in Maclean and Browne's *Catholicos of the East*. After his marriage and entry into political life—he served on the London School Board, etc.—Mr. Riley had less time to travel, but in the middle of all the innumerable activities which have made him an influential and familiar figure in most gatherings of Churchmen, Eastern Christianity retained a first claim on his time and affection. To attempt to sum up all that he has done in the past 45 years would be outside the scope of this Causerie. Suffice it to say that, during and since the War, he has been indefatigable in promoting the Anglican-Orthodox Entente, in championing the Orthodox cause and in supplying the practical needs of the Orthodox. The Russian Community in London recently presented him with an eikon in token of its gratitude for what he had done for the Russian exiles in England, *e.g.*, in securing them the use of St. Phillip's, Pimlico, in placing Russian orphans in British schools, and so on. The Jugo-Slav and Greek Governments have also awarded him decorations for similar assistance. Foreign Prelates and Theologians visiting London find him a gracious and unfailing host. Above all, both in the Conference Room with the Orthodox, *e.g.*, during the Lambeth Conference of 1920, and at the visit of the Patriarch Meletios in 1917, in the councils of the English Episcopate, on the Archbishop's E.C.C., and as Chairman of the A. and E.C.A. Committee, the services rendered by his ripe, if eager, wisdom and knowledge have been invaluable. Only eighteen months ago he joined one of our Editors at Belgrad, and made an important two months' tour with him in the Balkans. Among his many writings on the Near East are his well-known account of the Monastic Community on Mount Athos, his Life and Letters of Birk-

beck, and his incomparably easy and plain Guide to the Orthodox Liturgy, which makes it easy for the most uninstructed English monoglot to follow the dramatic movement of the Orthodox Eucharistic Rite.

Last of all, to have Mr. Riley's portrait—especially one so animated and good—should be a great satisfaction to readers of the Christian East, for if anyone can be styled the Founder of A. and E.C.A. it is he. The old Eastern Church Association, as all the Church ought to know, was the creation, in 1864, of such men as George Williams, J. M. Neale, and R. Littledale. In its day it did wonderful work in creating an interest in Eastern Christianity among Anglicans. By the end of the nineteenth century, however, though it included many distinguished and influential scholars and ecclesiastics in its membership, it had become somewhat inoperative. In result, some of its younger members started the Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches Union in 1906, the Rev. H. J. Fynes-Clinton, the Rev. R. F. Borough, its co-secretaries with the Rev. W. Wakeford, now dead, being its principal Founders. A. and E.O.C.U. having done excellent work, Mr. Riley, who was then Chairman of the E.C.A. Committee, arranged in 1916 that the two societies should be amalgamated and became the inevitable Chairman of the so-formed A. and E.C.A., of which as Chairman of the older of the two societies and as the principal promoter of their union he may be reckoned the Founder.

May he preside over its executive εἰς πολλὰ ἔτη.

* * *

The whole Christian World—Protestant and modern as Catholic and historic—has reason to celebrate the sixteenth centenary of the great Council of Nicæa in June. Accordingly, with the approbation of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in its presidential seat, the National Assembly has decided to ask for and to attend a Service of Commemoration in Westminster Abbey, probably on St. Peter's Day. We hope that Orthodox hierarchs will be asked to assist, that the Nicene Creed will be recited in Greek as well as in English, and that if it be so recited the *Filioque* will be omitted as it is provided that it should be omitted in Assemblies of Anglicans and Orthodox by the Suggested Terms of Intercommunion with the Orthodox, drafted by the Bishop of Gloucester and Dr. Brightman, and issued by the Archbishop's E.C.C. "to provoke discussion."

No finer *beau geste* could be made to our Eastern brethren, and, after all, in a commemoration of the first Œcumenical Council, propriety points to the Creed being recited as the Œcumenical Councils fashioned and prescribed it.

Incidentally, we hope to make our June issue a Nicene number.

The example set, when the unified Serb Church of Jugo-Slavia declared itself a Patriarchate, has been followed, with the consent of the Roumanian Government, by the unified Church of Roumania, the Metropolitan Miron Christea assuming the style of Patriarch of Roumania and Archbishop of Ungro-Vlachj, under a vote of the Greater Synod of Roumania on February 4th. The constitution of Roumania as a Patriarchate needs recognition, it is true, by the Œcumenical Patriarchate, and the other autokephalous Churches. A few years back the former might have hesitated to give it. But Meletios IV. welcomed the constitution of the Serb Patriarchate in 1923, and delay in general consent being given to that of the Roumanian is unlikely. The consequences involved by the change are not great. In the theory of the Orthodox Church, territorial jurisdiction is divided between its Patriarchs, who form a College of the type of the Imperial College, which, consisting of two or more Emperors, ruled the Roman Empire in theory as one. Thus, by the Canon of Chalcedon, 451, the College of Patriarchs was in number five, but, just as, though theoretically subordinate to the Empires, certain kingdoms were autonomous, so certain Metropolitanates, *e.g.*, Cyprus, were autokephalous. This theory is exemplified (*a*) in the Catechisms of the Orthodox Church, *e.g.*, in that recently put out by the Metropolitan Anthony of Kieff, in which the Patriarchates alone are specified as the jurisdictions to which the chief parts of the Orthodox Church are subject, and no mention is made of the Metropolitans-President of the Synods of autokephalous Metropolitical Churches, the former being the symbolic heads of the Church in their jurisdiction, and their Synods being dependent on them, and the latter being simply the Presidents of their Synods, which are the symbolic heads of their churches ; and (*b*) by the fact that, when any Patriarch visits a Metropolitical autokephalous Church, he carries his staff, and his name is mentioned in the Liturgy before that of the local Metropolitan-President, but the latter has no corresponding right or honour, and (*c*) during the " widowhood " of the Chief Throne of any autokephalous Church the names of all reigning Patriarchs, but not those of Metropolitans-President, are commemorated in the Liturgy.

While the number of the five recognised Patriarchates remained unaltered from 451 till 1922, there is nothing sacrosanct about it, and logic points to the present seven being increased to eight as soon as the Bulgar Church is reconciled to the Œcumenical Patriarchate.

* * *

The Russian Community in Constantinople was deprived last year, as will be remembered, of both its churches, that at the Embassy and that at the Russian Hospital. The Bolsheviks are now claiming the beautiful Church of the Russian Paris Parish in the Rue Daru

and the residences off its courtyard, including that of the Metropolitan Evlogie. Since their recognition by M. Herriot gives them legal probability of success, we are glad to know that, with the approval of Bishop McCormick, the American Bishop for Europe, Dr. Beekman, Dean of the American Pro-Cathedral of the Holy Trinity in Paris, has placed that building at the Metropolitan's disposal for the Celebration of the Sunday Liturgy, etc. The old sequestrated German Church in the Rue de la Crimée, for the purchase of which, with its schools, a deposit has been paid by the Russian Paris Parish, is also available. On the other hand, the Russians in Paris outnumber all aliens in London, and two churches are inadequate to their needs.

By the way, Lord Shaftesbury has forwarded £200 to the Metropolitan Evlogie, as the proceeds of his appeal for help towards the final purchase of the Rue de la Crimée property and its equipment as a Theological Academy. A good deal more money is, however, required for that purpose, and donations may be forwarded to Canon Douglas. But the Academy will soon begin to function, a course for 25 students being in process of arrangement.

* * *

Professor Bulgakoff, Priest of the Russian Prague Parish, spent a fortnight in London before Christmas, to confer with Bishop Russell Wakefield's Russian Clergy Appeal Committee. The Professor, who formerly held a Chair of Economics at Moscow, used to be a strong Socialist, and was only ordained since the Revolution, the Bolshevik Tyranny having changed his mind. While in London, he made many friends, visiting the Archbishop of Canterbury, with whose Eastern Churches Committee he held a consultation, attended the National Assembly, and gave a course of valuable addresses on Orthodoxy and Modern Life at the Russian House, S. Kensington. Our readers will like to know that Archbishop Anastasy, whom we welcomed in November, is now presiding over the Russian Church in Palestine. Our Pilgrims hope to visit him in May on the Mount of Olives.

A correspondent writes that the Turks, unable themselves to staff the wool and dried fruit trades, have invited a certain number of Greeks back to Smyrna and that, having no priest of their own, these are resorting to the Anglican Church for Confession, Communion, etc. We trust that authority is given for this economy.

* * *

The second Anglo-Catholic Pilgrimage to the Holy Land leaves London on Monday, April 27th, under the leadership of Dr. Russell Wakefield, lately Bishop of Birmingham. After a service on April 26th at St. Matthew's, Westminster, members will be blessed by the Bishop of Willesden and the Metropolitan of Thyatira. The

full accommodation of the s.s. *Sphinx*, we learn, is now practically allocated, and very few additions can be made to the Pilgrims' company. On the return way, stops will be made at Cyprus, Patmos, Smyrna, Constantinople, and Athens. Arrangements are in progress for a visit to Nicosia, the capital of the first-named, in the Metropolia of which Archbishop Cyrillos, well known as the third head of an Orthodox Church to accept the validity of our Ordinations, is to receive the Pilgrims, who should prove missionaries of Reunion.

* * *

Mention of the Pilgrimage brings to mind the issue of a portfolio of twelve views of the Holy City by the Pro-Jerusalem Society, of which the Governor of Jerusalem, Sir Ronald Storrs, is the founder and driving force. The views, including, of course, the Dome of the Rock, are from originals by Mr. Benor Ralter, and are of surprising merit and value. The portfolio, which may be had of Mrs. Kelly, M.B.E., the Arts and Crafts of Palestine, 5, Harrington Road, S.W.7, will interest the Pilgrims and those who stay at home.

Sir R. Storrs and the Pro-Jerusalem Society were responsible, it will be remembered, for those wonderful models which fascinated every visitor to Wembley, from the Archbishop of Canterbury to the choir-boys of country churches.

Mr. Sidney Dark's account of the first Pilgrimage should also be read, and we understand Mrs. Olive Shiner is shortly publishing an impression of the Holy Land—*His Own Country*—which will take a permanent place along with the Rev. G. N. Whittingham's *The Land of Fadeless Splendour* in Palestinian bibliography.

* * *

The Bishop of Gibraltar contributes an important, lucid and suggestive article on the Œcumenical Patriarchate to the March number of *Theology*. Everyone ought to read it. We venture again to express our profound gratitude for the personal work done by Dr. Greig in the Near East. He cares greatly and has the art of doing and saying the right thing at the right time.

* * *

Bishop Gore, the Chairman of the Archbishops' E.C.C., left England a few days after Christmas for a four months' visit to Egypt and Palestine. Reference has been made repeatedly in this Chronicle and Causerie to the extraordinarily fruitful Union Conferences between Anglicans, Orthodox, Copts, Jacobites and Armenians, organised by the Bishop of Khartoum in Cairo. Bishop Gore arrived in Egypt in time for one of these, and we await eagerly the report of its proceedings. Meanwhile, we have received an account of the service connected with it, held in All Saints, Cairo, in which the Greek Metropolitan of Nubia, Copts and Armenians assisted.

The *Daily Mail*, in a leading article criticising the Archbishop of Canterbury for interpellating Lord Curzon as to the expulsion of the Œcumenical Patriarchate, made no less than three capital blunders as to facts in 200 words. Did the office boy produce that ebullition, or Lord Rothermere?

* * *

It seems probable that the Œcumenical Council of the Orthodox Church, which has been planned to be convened this year at Jerusalem will be postponed. With the Œcumenical Patriarchate in the throes of Kemalist repression, its session can hardly be possible. And yet, to say nothing of the final acceptance of Anglican Ordinations, there are many urgent questions, *e.g.*, the change of the Calendar, the remarriage of the secular clergy, etc., recommended by the Constantinople Pan-Orthodox Conference of 1923, awaiting its decision. The postponement—if it be postponed—of the Synod will be a proof of the need of a European Settlement of the Œcumenical Patriarchal question.

* * *

We rejoice to know that Bishop Brent is doing all in his power to carry on the late Mr. Gardiner's preparations for the World Conference on Faith and Order, and has issued a fifth Paper of Questions which deals with the Sacraments.

* * *

We rejoice also to congratulate Prof. N. Glubokovsky in his Academic Jubilee, *i.e.*, the 35th anniversary of his Professorship. We trust that the famous Russian historical-theologian will visit us this year.

* * *

We are glad, indeed, that Archdeacon Stacy Waddy has accepted the principal Secretaryship of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, an office which not only gives him the active direction of that world-wide Society, but fixes his residence in London. Since 1919, when, after serving as a Chaplain of the Forces in Palestine, he joined the staff of St. George's at Jerusalem, the Archdeacon had been the *liaison* agent of the Anglican Church for the Jerusalem Patriarchate and in that capacity had rendered signal service to our cause. It will be good to have him at home.

* * *

Their many friends in England will be glad to know that Fathers Timotheieff and Vesseliovsky, of St. Philip's, Pimlico, have received the *kamilavsky*—the right to wear which in the Russian Church is given as a distinction to priests of meritorious service. The *kamilavsky* is, of course, the Greek *kalimavky*—the brimless top hat of the Greek priest which, with a veil, forms the head-dress of the

(*Continued on page* 46).

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM IN THE ORTHODOX CHURCH OF GREECE.

By Professor Hamilcar Alivisatos, of the University of Athens.

THE Greek Church had felt itself prejudiced for several years past by the application of the three laws which deal, (1) with the constitution of the Holy Synod, (2) with Bishops and their Dioceses, (3) with Parishes. Its objection to them was that, on the one hand, an over-centralised system had been created for it, and on the other, that they had opened the way to an intervention of the State in the details of ecclesiastical affairs which was becoming continually more and more oppressive.

Those complaints were not wholly without ground, so that the Church feels great satisfaction in the fact that, after prolonged efforts, she has at last secured two new laws which are already in full application.

I propose to describe both the provisions and scope of the former laws and of those recently enacted and now in force.

Ecclesiastical Administration under Laws 200 and 201 of July, 1852.

Hitherto the Administration of the Church of Greece had been based upon Law 200, *sc.* "Concerning Bishops, Bishoprics, and the Clergy who minister under the Jurisdiction of the Episcopate," and upon Law 201, *sc.* "Concerning the composition of the Holy Synod of the Church of Greece."

By Law 201 the supreme authority in the Church consisted of the Holy Synod, which was composed of the Metropolitan of Athens, as President, and of four members styled "Synodals," and summoned successively every second year according to their seniority in the Episcopate.

This Synod was in continual session at Athens.

As the representative of the Government and as a link between Church and State, a Royal Procurator had a seat on this Synod. Without his presence the Synod could not be in session, and without his counter-signature neither documents issued by it nor its minutes were valid. Though without a vote, he was present at all the sessions of the Synod, but had the right neither to take part in its discussions nor to express his opinion. Though it was possible at any moment to compel him to follow the proceedings of the Synod as a silent onlooker, he was always heard, however, either on the request or by the leave of the President and the Synod.

The bureau of the Synod was composed of a First and Second Secretary, from two to four clerks and an usher.

The internal and external functions of the Synod, as laid down by this Law, not only overlapped each other but for the most part consisted of functions which belong essentially to a Bishop.

Besides the function of enquiry into and decision upon matters of faith, worship and morals, the Synod, by a majority vote of its five members, elected new bishops, revised the decisions of the Episcopal Courts, and was itself the Court of First Instance to try charges against Bishops such as involved degradation in the case of the lower clergy. Ecclesiastical sentences, however, were submitted by it to the State.

Law 200 limited the Dioceses in the Kingdom to 30, a number which was increased by Royal Ordinance on Jan. 22nd, 1900, to 32 and finally, on the division of that of Chalkis, to 33.

The same Law further prescribed the method of the election of a Bishop. The Synod submitted three names to the Government and the choice of one of them by the latter was final.

Since the Bishops hold their sees for life, the translation of a Bishop could be effected only in exceptional circumstances and then by a decision of the Synod with the approval of the Government. In practice this provision was abortive, and was applied only in the case of a translation to the Metropolitical Throne of Athens.

Under the same Law, a Bishop, pronounced by medical diagnosis and a resolution of the Synod to be incapable of fulfilling his functions, was relieved of them.

The Diocesan Committee in the first instance, and afterwards a *locum tenens*, nominated by the Synod and appointed by Ordinance of the Crown, administered all dioceses whatsoever between their vacancy and the election of a new Bishop.

Besides the personal enquiry and investigation in matters of Faith which he exercised within his own diocese, every bishop had a diocesan court, over which he himself presided, to help him, and clergy of the diocese were tried in it. Independently of this, the Synod decided, on appeal, various cases relating to mixed, uncanonical and illegal marriages, and, by a bad custom which obtained, often sanctioned, with an extreme complaisance in economy, the celebration of weddings of parties in forbidden degrees, without the licence so granted by the Synod being understood to convey the validity in civil law which was sought, to marriages celebrated on its basis and with its sanction.

Finally, the Law contained several general provisions for the control and direction of their Clergy by the Bishops.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE AUTOKEPHALOUS CHURCH OF GREECE UNDER THE NEW LAW OF 21ST DECEMBER, 1923.

Laws 200 and 201 being superseded by Resolutions 35432 and 33957 of the Revolutionary Assembly, the Administration of the Church is based on the Organic Law of the Autokephalous Church of Greece, as provided in the latter Resolution passed on 21st December, 1923.

The Synod of five members, which, its majority being only three, had hitherto controlled the Church, has been abolished and the whole hierarchy of the Autokephalous Church of Greece has assumed its Administration and, having been constituted its Synod, forms the highest Supreme Ecclesiastical Authority in the State.

Unless it be summoned at other times by State Ordinance, this Synod assembles automatically annually in the month of October.

This substantial reform possesses the greatest importance; inasmuch as, since matters of the greatest moment often come up for decision by the present Synod, consisting of 33 members, its decision must plainly be better than the decisions of the old Synod of five members, or, rather, of its majority of three; especially since the fixed work of the former Synod was insignificant. A Procurator—styled the State Procurator—attends the present Synod after the manner of the former's Royal Procurator, but his relation to it is somewhat different from that of his predecessor.

In the first place, certain qualifications suitable to the relation which he holds to the Synod, are specified as desirable in whoever occupies the position. These vary from those of a Judge in the Criminal Courts or an University Professor to those of an advocate in the Courts of Appeal.

Again, as before, the presence of the Procurator cannot be dispensed with by the Synod. But his absence does not invalidate its session, inasmuch as certain deputies are prescribed to take his place, the failure to summon whom in writing would, in the absence of the official Procurator, invalidate it.

Further, as before, the Procurator attends the Synod without the power to vote, but he now has the right to speak and to express his opinion on the matters under discussion.

Lastly, a substantial change has been made in the Procurator's function and authority. For, whereas under the old conditions he had the oppressive right of giving his counter-signature to documents issued by the Synod and to its minutes, or of withholding it; and whereas without it they were invalid, his counter-signature is now obligatory and he can in no way change the decisions of the Synod.

As before, the Synod has two secretaries and an usher.

The functions of the present Synod, while in the main the same as those of its predecessor, differ from it in this that, although as a central body it has supreme ecclesiastical authority, their proper functions are restored to individual Diocesans.

Thus, marriage questions will be dealt with in the future by the Diocesans, who recover their proper responsibility in its fullness, which they will also exercise in regard to administrative matters and to questions bearing upon faith and worship; the Synod, however, as supreme, keeping the right to supervise them in the latter and to conduct formal investigations into their actions.

Further, the Synod retains the right to elect new Bishops, but with these distinctions, that whereas in the past three Bishops chose them, thirty-three do so now, and that the choice is made from a list of eligibles approved by the Government.

Formerly the Synod put forward three names, of which the Government chose one. Now, the Minister of Cults will have the right to strike out up to one half of the names on the list which he disapproves, and the election will be made from the rest. Accordingly, while the Government will possess its proper part in the choice of Bishops, it will no longer be able to abuse its power. The number of Bishops remains the same, and the Bishops so elected exercise, as before, their normal episcopal functions in the moderated subordination of their sees, which is necessary for an established centralisation. Translation is now permissible, but with safeguards which prevent its abuse. Diocesan administration is taken from Bishops unable to fulfil their office and is placed in the hands of Bishops-coadjutor appointed as above. Its own Protosyncellos (Chancellor) administers a vacant see until the election of the new Bishop.

The new Law also recasts the system of Ecclesiastical Courts consistently. Appeals which formerly reached the Synod in a bulk which destroyed its efficiency, will, in future, be decided at the centre by what may be called Revisers, drawn from the different civil areas of civil administration.

Bishops will, as is provided in Orthodox Canon Law, be judged by a Court of thirteen Bishops to which also, on appeal, will be referred the verdicts of the Revisers. Finally, the decision of the thirteen Bishops, as also the judgments of all the Ecclesiastical Courts, will be brought before a special Court of the Synod, which will constitute the Supreme Areopagos of the Church.

The ordinances touching Marriage and Divorce remain unchanged.

Finally, provisions are made for improved procedure and despatch in several matters.

THE USE AND CUSTODY OF PARISH CHURCHES UNDER THE LAW (3596) OF 9TH MARCH, 1910.

The then existing disorder of the parochial system was in some measure remedied by the Royal Ordinance of 8th June, 1856, which was itself utilised and supplemented by later Ordinances. But in spite of that it remained so great that a further attempt to remedy it was made in the Law of 9th March, 1910, "Concerning Parish Churches," and by the Royal Ordinances of 1910, 1911, and 1912 consequent from it.

Notwithstanding its ineffectiveness and the confusion in its provisions, that Law had three good results:

1. It brought some order into Parochial finance and into the administration and usage of Parochial property.

2. It removed, as far as was possible, the interference of the secular local authorities in the finance, etc., of the Parish Churches.

3. It restored to the laity their rights, of which they had been deprived piecemeal, in the management, administration and usage of the Parish Churches.

In addition it gave the laity a voice in the appointment of the local Clergy by allowing them to make certain requirements as to the qualifications, and to guarantee the payment of the stipends, of their Ministers.

It is true that the provisions of the Law as to the appointment of Clergy were in practice unimportant, since that appointment depended largely upon their stipends, which, although the Law fixed them, were, in fact, themselves dependent in part on the financial position of the parishes and sometimes on the good or bad stewardship of local Committees.

In regard to details: a distinction was made by the Law between Parish Churches and Chapelries, and by bringing the latter under the former, the exploitation of which by private individuals was in a measure prevented.

Provision was also made for a revenue for the Parish Churches. The annual six drachmas ordered to be collected from every parishioner, even though not always forthcoming, served both to increase the revenues of the Parish Churches and taught the parishioners to appreciate the responsibility which their use of them entailed.

The Law further defined the election of the Parochial Committees, fixed the number of households necessary to constitute a Parish and the number of Parochial Clergy that should correspond with the number of households in it.

Finally, the Law and its consequent Royal Ordinances laid down the qualifications of a Parish Priest and his stipend, as well as

certain particulars in regard to his work in general and as to the Parochial Registry and the general work of the Clergy.

The method of the selection of the Parish Clergy was also laid down precisely—the basis being the acceptance by the Bishop of the qualifications required by the voters and the Bishop then appointed, and, if necessary, ordained the person designated by the election.

The Organisation, Administration and Usage of Parish Churches under the Law Concerning Parish Churches of 17th December, 1923.

While the existing insufficiencies of the existing Law as to Parish Churches made necessary the passing of a new Law, two causes made a fresh reform of Parochial machinery the more imperative.

First, by, as it were, heaping up documents in the Ministry and the Prefectures, the existing Law had brought into being a system which, being over-centralised and bureaucratic, had ended in the paralysis of the local machinery. This was remedied.

Secondly, which was more important, it was plain that a way must be found to furnish the Parish Clergy with remuneration adequate to their needs and to the standard of living in the present day. For, with the present stipends offered to them, not only are men of education and social position deterred from seeking ordination, but the existing Clergy cannot live on the meagre stipends which they receive and of which, as has been said, the regular payment not infrequently depends upon the good management of Parish Finance.

Those were the two evils which the recent Law was passed to remedy. In regard to the first, as, on the one hand, the provisions of this Law have secured the desired decentralisation by providing that business which was concentrated in the Ministerial Bureau should now in part be transacted in Metropolitans' Diocesan Councils, so, on the other hand, that business is more swiftly despatched and the profitless reference to the Prefecture and the Ministry of that type of business which formerly had to be sent there in spite of its unimportance, has been avoided.

At the same time, the right of the Government to intervene, either to veto or to arbitrate in matters which from either their economic or administrative aspect are of greater importance, has been preserved.

In regard to the second, inasmuch as its provisions seem to be admirably adapted, the payment imposed by this Law upon the Parishes and Parish Churches should go a long way to secure the provision of a revenue sufficient to guarantee the adequate and suitable remuneration of the Parish Clergy. For while it is true that the scheme is unlikely to produce the quantum needed for their

stipends, its application should, little by little, bring about the raising of that sum.

In its details this Law also defines the relation of Parish Churches, of Chapels and of Proprietary Chapels. It fixes the number of households in the Parishes according to the population of the several cities and districts. It defines, as far as it can define, the composition of Parochial Councils and, under the Metropolitans' Councils, their administration and usage of the property of the Parish. It prescribes that the qualifications of the Parish Clergy shall be in accordance with the population of the cities and districts, and provides both for their election by the Parishioners and for their approval and appointment by the Metropolitans. It also apportions their stipends to their qualifications and makes provision for supplementing the resources of the General Ecclesiastical Treasury, which pays them, by the issue of special ecclesiastical notes.

Finally, it deals with peculiar types of Churches, *e.g.*, the Evangelistria of Naxos, the Church of Hydra, etc., with the particular problems of particular Parishes, with the Clergy who have no qualifications, with the lower *personnel* of the Parishes and with whatever relates to its own application.

CHRONICLE AND CAUSERIE—*Continued.*

Russian higher clergy, and is said to be derived from *kalymma*, a covering, and *auchen*, the neck. The Greeks say that, before the Turk appeared, the *kalimavky* was not brimless, the brim being cut off by the Sultan Selim the Sot's order to differentiate the Orthodox *rayah* from the clergy of Europe.

* * *

The Patriarch Gregorios of Antioch has sent a warm letter of thanks to the Rev. C. B. Moss for a cheque of £100 collected by the A.C. Pilgrims for the repair of the old church at Baalbek. One of our old Serb students, hearing of this, writes pleading that he would wish to place on the walls of the new church which he wishes to build in his poor village, a tablet recording that "This church was rebuilt by the help of charitable English people." Father French will forward subscriptions.

REMEMBER RUSSIA!

THERE must have been many of us who, hearing of Lenin's death, breathed the wish that was really a prayer, that this might be the beginning of the end of Russia's woes.

From Palestine to Russia is a far cry, and to the superficial observer there is no connection between the two save a political one. But their only real tie has a deep spiritual significance; and it is because we love Palestine that we also love Russia.

There have been no Russian Pilgrimages to Palestine since 1914. Before the next year came round, Russia was at war; and since 1917 she has been in chains. Those Russian Pilgrimages were marvellous events—the most marvellous since the days of the First Crusade when, from pure love of God, the prisons were closed and the churches filled, and the whole ardour of the nations was bent only upon the freeing of the Holy Sepulchre and not upon worldly advantage. Think of it! Year after year they came, in their thousands, from every village, town, and hamlet throughout Russia; all old people—you seldom saw a young face in their ranks—men and women who had toiled and saved and scraped all their lives for *this*—to walk humbly through the stony ways of Palestine, to kneel at the sacred shrines, to pray. These were no easy pilgrimages, such as sometimes came from Western Europe. The Russians walked everywhere, many of them even thinking it a sin to ride across "those sacred fields" once trod by the blessed Feet of Christ. The very old and the infirm or ailing, they only, rode. In some cases a whole village clubbed the savings of many hard years to send one pilgrim to represent it at the Tomb of Christ; and this one man or woman would gather together many little relics of infinite preciousnesss and sanctity, to take back to the faithful at home, each tiny treasure being laid upon each sacred shrine in turn.

A Russian Consul once said, "Each Russian pilgrim is worth to Palestine, on an average, about £10."

The money, great as the sum must have been in the aggregate, was the least of the pilgrims' gift to Palestine. They brought into her a religious devotion as deep as it was genuine, and a fervour of unquestioning belief unequalled elsewhere in a disillusioned world. Fasting, they walked from place to place in the Holy Land, from Nazareth to Tiberias, from Bethlehem to Hebron, from Jerusalem to Jordan, companies of old and poor and often very weary men and women; worn hands clasping rough pilgrim-staffs, and on each face the seal of the most enduring patience. Sheep-like they trudged along together, kissed the same holy pictures in turn, fell prostrate at the same holy site; asking nothing better than to give their mite for its enrichment; fleeced alike by priest and monk and beggar—yes, just like sheep they were, as dumbly patient, as gentle,

and as unquestioning. Rapt beyond thought of self, they brought to Palestine the leaven of a most wonderful faith. God walked the streets and ways with them, and His glory blazed in every bush. As they went about in little bands, you seldom heard them talk; but from the moving lips, the cross signed on breast or brow, you knew they spoke to God. It was impossible to watch a Russian pilgrim congregation in church without catching some faint reflection of their fire. Neither time nor person then existed for them, their whole being was concentrated on the service; and if you could not pray with them in words you could not help but pray with the understanding that transcends all words.

The inspiration of their faith and love has been taken from Palestine, not by the War but by a tribulation greater than war. That Russia will come through, a living soul, we know; for a people which is able to suffer and endure as she does must be informed by a spiritual force immeasurably great. But what of Palestine? No one any more cares for her ways, her shrines, as the Russian pilgrims did. No one any more pours out upon her fragrance of love and faith, nor draws in happiness with the mere breathing of her lovely air.

Even to our dim sight her loss is plain. What bitterness of rival creeds and politics, what futile antagonisms of race with race, what grasping after power by party set against party, have marred the Holy Land! How pitiful it is that Palestine should be so utterly distracted and absorbed by her own troubles that she can spare no thought for Russia, lend no helping hand to light again the lamps on Russia's neglected altars, return nothing of her soul's vast debt to Russia.

ESTELLE BLYTH.

In Great Britain we often ignore the work done for our cause by the intercourse of Anglican Bishops and Priests with the large Orthodox communities in U.S.A. and the King's Overseas Dominions. A reminder of this comes to us in the news that the Greek Colony in Brisbane has just presented Canon Garland with a Cross and other *insignia* in recognition of his services to Orthodoxy.

Copies of the photo of the Bishops and Clergy at A. and E.C.A.'s Liturgy last November in St. Sophia may be had, price 2s. 6d., of Father French.

Archbishop Germanos addressed 3,000 people in Liverpool Cathedral in February at the Bishop's invitation. As always, he received a great welcome.

The Vartabed Grigore Goussan has taken up the charge of the Armenian Church of St. Sarkhis, Iverna Gardens, W. The Greek Easter this year is a week later than our own. We advise those who can to attend the Services on their Good Friday morning or afternoon—both are singularly impressive and symbolic.

CONSTANTINOPLE FIRST:
A Plea for a Sound Re-Union.

BY THE

REV. A. R. SHARPE, *formerly Scholar of New College.*

Paper Cover, 1/6. By Post, 1/7.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR:

"PERFECTION AND THE ONLY ALTERNATIVE."

Adapted, by the leave of Bishop Claughton, from Fr. Scaramelli's "Discernimento."

Paper Cover, 2/. Cloth, 3/6. Postage, 2d.

Rochester: STEDMAN and CO., Printers and Publishers.

THE ENGLISH CHURCH UNION.

Hon. Treasurer: The VISCOUNT HALIFAX.

President: The EARL OF CHICHESTER, K.P.

I. THE UNION OF CLERGY AND LAITY are banded to effect, for Objects, ends: (1) To defend and promote, wherever the Doctrine, Discipline, and practice of the Church of England be or become identical with those of the Catholic Church of Christ; (2) To afford mutual support, protection, and assistance to all members of the Church, suffering under unjust aggression or interference in spiritual matters; and (3) to prevent, as far as may be, by God's help, a breaking asunder for the present time of the Church of England from the Church of the Apostles.

Communications of the Branch Church are eligible for election to membership.

Terms of Subscription:

Members, Associates, etc., pay annually, Associates (laymen), 2s. 6d., and clergy, 5s. Members, Associates, etc., pay annually, Associates (laymen), 2s. 6d., and clergy, 5s. Members pay, in addition to the Union, 2s. 6d. annually for expenses only, but to provide for the Union's Organ, The Church Union Gazette, and all such general needs as the Council of the Union may from time to time determine.

Members and Associates of the Union are entitled to the Church Union Gazette at half price, 1d. monthly, and to receive from the Secretary such publications as may be issued by the Union.

Members and Associates are entitled to attend the Annual Meeting of the Union, and to vote at Elections, which is held in order to deal with pressing needs in such Church matters as may arise. Members and Associates are entitled to attend the Conferences and the Church Congress, and to receive the Reports of such Conferences and Congress. Members and Associates are entitled to ask questions and the most urgent need of Catholics to-day. For this and further information apply to the Secretary, and the full prospectus will be sent.

ARNOLD STEPHENS, Secretary.

Offices: 2, Dean's Yard, Westminster, S.W.

PERIODICALS RECEIVED.

The Church Quarterly Review. Suggested.

Publishers.

The Contemporary Review, Alexandria.

Publishers.

The Fortnightly Review, Alexandria.

Publishers.

The Nineteenth Century, Jerusalem.

Publishers.

The Edinburgh Review, Athens.

Publishers.

The Quarterly Review, Athens.

Publishers.

The Westminster Review, Bucharest.

Publishers.

The Archæological Review, Limassol, Cyprus.

Publishers.

The Church Quarterly Review, Athens.

Publishers.

The Church Quarterly Review, Athens.

Publishers.

The Church Quarterly Review, Athens

Eastern Church Books.

THE RELATIONS OF THE ANGLICAN CHURCHES WITH THE EASTERN ORTHODOX. By the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. 304 pp. Price 12s. Popular edition, 3/6.

"Those who wish to know about the subject should read Mr. Douglas' volume, as I have read it, my good friend." The Archbishop of Canterbury in Convocation, Feb. 25th, 1919.

A DICTIONARY OF THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH. By Dr. R. Ll. Isaacson-Jasse. Price 7/6.

WHO'S WHO IN THE EARLY CHURCH. By Rev. W. C. Piercy. 7s. 6d.

LINKS IN THE CHAIN OF RUSSIAN CHURCH HISTORY. By Dr. W. H. Frere, Bishop of Truro. Price 7/6. Popular edition, 3/6.

THE REDEMPTION OF ST. SOPHIA. By the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. Introduction by Bishop Gore. Fourth Edition. Price 2s. 6d. paper; cloth, 5s.

"Its present authority."—Indian Review. "We cannot too warmly commend Mr. Douglas' book. It includes all that need be known on the subject."—Church Times.

THE CHURCH AND FAITH OF ARMENIA. By Dr. Arsh Abrahamian, Armenian Vartaped in London. Price 2s. 6d. paper; cloth, 5s.

"All interested in the Armenian Question should read this."—Methodist Times.

ASSYRIAN CHURCH CUSTOMS AND THE MURDER OF MAR SHIMUN. By Lady Surma d'Bait Mar Shimun. Introduction by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Glossary by Dr. Wigram. Price 2s. 6d. paper.

THE BAQUBAH REFUGEE CAMP. By Brigadier-General H. H. Austin. Paper, 2s. 6d.

THE SPIRITUAL REBIRTH OF EUROPE. By Bishop Nicholai Velimirovic. 2s. 6d. paper.

CYPRIOTE SHRINES. By Commander Luke. 2s. 6d. paper.

PICTURES OF RUSSIAN WORSHIP. By the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. 2s. 6d.

DEATH'S RIDE IN ANATOLIA AND ASIA MINOR. By the Rev. J. A. Douglas, B.D. 6d.

SKETCHES OF EASTERN CHURCH LIFE. By Archimandrite Kephala. Introduction by the Bishop of London. Paper, 2s. 6d.; cloth, 5s.

THE ENGLISH AND ARMENIAN CHURCHES. By Harold Buxton. 6d.

INTERCOMMUNION WITH THE ASSYRIAN CHURCH. By the Rev. Dr. W. A. Wigram. 6d.

THE DIVINE LITURGY OF ST. CHRYSOSTOM. Translated by the Rev. F. E. Brightman, M.A., from the Greek and collated with the Slavonic. 2s. 6d.

THE SEPARATION OF THE MONOPHYSITES. By the Rev. W. A. Wigram. 2s. 6d.

THE ALL-NIGHT VIGIL OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH. Translation edited by the Revs. B. Timotheeff, B.D., and V. Tchetverikoff. 1s.

FAITH PRESS, Ltd., 53, Russell Square, London, W.C.1.

MARRAYE LTD., THE ROW, CRUWYS-MORCHARD.